

The COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

(Published twice monthly).

Vol. VIII. No. 20.

Workers Library Publishers.
P.O. Box 148, Station D, New York.

December 1st, 1931

CONTENTS

	Page
A PRELIMINARY APPRAISAL OF THE RECENT ELECTION IN ENGLAND - - - - -	642
MR. ROY in the SERVICE of BRITISH IMPERIALISM AND THE NATIONAL CONGRESS - - -	648
THE REVOLUTIONARY CRISIS IN CHINA AND THE TASKS OF THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS	656
SOME QUESTIONS REGARDING THE HISTORY OF BOLSHEVISM By J. Stalin	664
Obituary: Kofarjiev. THE FRESH WAVE OF WHITE TERROR IN BULGARIA - By P. Iskrov	670
CORRECTIONS TO THE "COMMON FATE OF CAPITALISM AND SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY" -	673
THE MINORITY IN THE FRENCH UNITED GENERAL CONFEDERATION OF LABOUR IN THE SERVICE OF THE BOURGEOISIE By Vassiliev	675
REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE BUREAU OF THE R.I.L.U. - - - - -	681
THE STRUGGLE FOR INDIAN STATE INDEPEN- DENCE : A Condition of the Success of the English Proletariat - - - - - By Valia	694

TWENTY CENTS

A PRELIMINARY APPRAISAL OF THE RECENT ELECTIONS IN ENGLAND

1. CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THE ELECTIONS WERE HELD.

THE following is but a preliminary appraisal of the recent General Election held in England because the deep-lying and shifting processes now developing within the English proletariat, which were reflected in the elections distortedly as if in a convex mirror, must first be thoroughly studied, and this has not yet been done.

First of all, let us recall, in general terms, what were the conditions under which the English parliamentary elections took place last October. The decline and decay of British imperialism found their expression during the post-war period in technical backwardness and in a marked decrease in the production of the main branches of industry—the iron manufacturing, the steel foundries, coal, ship-building and textile industries; in the growth of non-productive, parasitic consumption (thus in 1928-29 £19,000,000 sterling of new capital were invested in hotels, restaurants, etc., but only £7,000,000 sterling in machine-tools for the coal and metal industry), in the colossal growth of unemployment, which increased under the Labour Government from 1,540,000 to 2,713,000, and finally in the adverse trade balance, amounting to £158,000,000 sterling in 1913, and to £366,000,000 sterling in 1929.

This decline was, however, compensated, to a certain extent, by the huge incomes from foreign investments, banking operations and shipping, which the vast British Colonial Empire could draw on. As a result, despite the adverse trade balance, there was a favourable balance of payments amounting to £181,000,000 sterling in 1913, £86,000,000 sterling in 1924, £137,000,000 in 1927, and £138,000,000 in 1929. This made it possible for the British Empire to balance its State budget, to maintain the stability of the pound sterling, to keep wages on a comparatively higher level than other European capitalist countries, and to pay unemployment relief also on a comparatively higher basis than other capitalist countries.

But the world economic crisis was sapping the strength of and had actually undermined these factors which used to disguise and compensate partly for the decline of British imperialism. In 1930 the surplus in the balance of payments for that year fell from £138,000,000 sterling to £30,000,000 sterling, and towards the middle of 1931 England already accumulated an adverse balance of payments amounting to from £50,000,000 to £100,000,000 sterling. This unfavourable balance created a

deficit amounting to £121,000,000 in the 1931 State budget of England, which until recently had been the world's banker. This threatened one of the pillars of British imperialism, the renowned English pound sterling.

The threat of an approaching financial crisis made it imperative for British imperialism to place on its agenda a general attack on the working-class, to find a capitalist solution for the crisis. A general outline for this attack was already suggested by the May Commission, organised by the Labour Government. It amounted to this: there was to be a large decrease in unemployment relief, a general reduction in wages, a higher tariff, all resulting in a higher cost of living. To carry out this predatory attack against the working-class, the Labour Government, which had just suffered a split in its ranks, gave place to the so-called "National Government," headed by MacDonald, who already began to carry out the recommendations of the May Commission in a somewhat modified form,—recommendations to which, incidentally, Henderson, now in the "opposition," also had, some time before, agreed. The formation of the National Government was therefore connected with the split in the Labour Party. In order to keep the dissatisfied working masses under the influence of the Labour Party, and, in order to head off the development of revolutionary demonstrations among the masses in reply to the general attack of the bourgeoisie, the Labour Party became the "opposition" to the "National Government," and expelled MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas, who had entered the Government, from the Party.

The National Government which was formed, like the "National Government" during the imperialist war set up to save the fatherland, proved powerless to prevent the approaching crash. The pound sterling collapsed even sooner than was expected, in connection with the financial crisis in Germany and with the tricky manipulations of "friendly" French imperialism which, by hastily withdrawing its deposits from the Bank of England, put obstacles in its path and helped trip up its ally. British imperialism which before the war was the foremost leader of world capitalism, was forced to seek aid from its allies, France and the United States, in order to escape a financial catastrophe. While thus being defeated in the world arena, the internal situation of British capitalism also became precarious. The attack on unemployment relief caused a wave of demonstrations of the unemployed, which spread over the whole country, expressing itself in what must be described as sharp clashes of the unemployed and

the police, an occurrence unheard of in England since the time of the Chartist movement. The revolt which broke out in the Atlantic Fleet in connection with the reduction of the sailors' wages was an even more unprecedented and ominous occurrence. Two pillars of British imperialism, the pound sterling and the British fleet proved unreliable and were tottering. The situation became so threatening that the director of the Bank of England, Montague Norman, voicing the panicky sentiments of a wide strata of the bourgeoisie, particularly the petty bourgeoisie, declared: "If something extraordinary does not happen to prevent it, capitalism may crash in the near future, perhaps even within the next year."

Under these circumstances the Conservatives decided to *take the reins of government directly into their own hands*, by obtaining a solid majority in the English Parliament through its dissolution and the holding of new elections, which would relegate the Labour Party to the rôle of a parliamentary "opposition" or, in fact, to the rôle of a lightning conductor to absorb the impending storms and facilitate the general attack of the bourgeoisie against the working-class, carried out under the slogan of "saving the nation."

2. THE PARLIAMENTARY VICTORY OF THE CONSERVATIVES.

The elections were fought out *formally* between the Conservatives, headed by the national bloc, and the Labour Party coming out under the mask of "the opposition." On the surface, one could only see this struggle between the two Parties, the Conservatives and the Labour Party. The Liberals divided against themselves almost completely stepped out of the picture during these elections, in so far as, with the exception of the small Free Trade group of Lloyd George, their platform was not in any way to be distinguished from that of the Conservatives and with whom they were in accord. On the other hand, the Communist Party was still too weak to leave any impress on the elections. Formally, the Conservatives attacked the Labour Party during the elections by launching the slogan: "Defend the interests of the nation against socialism." But in reality, the Conservatives were fully aware that the Labour Party does not represent the slightest socialist threat against the bourgeoisie, but that on the contrary, it is the main social support of the latter. In reality the Conservatives, fighting the Labour Party for seats in Parliament, were in the long run aiming not at the Labour Party but at the working-class, which was very anxious to protect itself against the offensive of capital, and had repeatedly expressed this eagerness in important economic battles: witness the general strike of 1926 and the demonstrations of the unemployed in 1931. However, it had not yet found

the real road to its emancipation, had not yet realised the necessity of a revolutionary solution of the crisis, and therefore let itself be influenced during these elections by the social demagogy of the Labour Party. On the surface the struggle was being waged between the bourgeoisie and its agents, between the Conservatives and the Labour Party scrambling for seats in Parliament, and in this parliamentary struggle the Conservatives came out fully victorious. In reality, behind all this what was going on was a class struggle between the Conservatives *together* with the Labour Party (though different methods were employed) and the proletariat which was becoming radicalised. In this struggle, as we shall see, the bourgeoisie did not come out victorious, despite the fact that the proletariat, the vast bulk of it, had not yet taken to the road of revolutionary action and did not yet fight under the banner of the Communist Party, though the parliamentary victory of the Conservatives will of course smooth the path for their attack upon the working-class.

The *direct and immediate* aim of the Conservatives was to win a formidable majority in Parliament, thus creating a solid parliamentary basis for a decisive attack on the working-class and for the strengthening of their imperialist aggressiveness. To realise this immediate aim, they proclaimed the national platform. During the election campaign they naturally did not lay all their cards on the table and spoke least of all about the necessity to reduce wages, to deprive the unemployed of relief, to increase the cost of living, to involve the workers in an imperialist war, etc., etc. They only spoke of the necessity of reviving British industry and securing work for the unemployed by means of protective tariffs. They harped mostly on the necessity of giving the Government a free hand to restore the pound sterling to par, and consequently rescuing the savings of the small fry. They called for national unity, and, in accordance with that, asked the people to vote for the National Government headed by "Dr. MacDonald." However, prominent leaders of the Conservative Party, like Churchill and Co., made no attempt to hide the leading role of the Conservative Party in the national bloc. The parliamentary manoeuvre of the Conservatives was quite successful, and their immediate aim was fully attained in the brilliant parliamentary landslide of the last elections.

Not only the bourgeoisie, but almost the entire petty bourgeoisie and the privileged upper strata of the working-class, frightened by the crash of the pound sterling and the dire symptoms of the fall of the British Empire, rushed to the side of the Conservatives and their open allies. The Conservatives, polling 11,872,482 votes at the election, gained 3,208,239 votes in comparison with the elections of 1929. But, besides the Conservatives, the National Labourites (the group of MacDonald, Snowden and

Thomas who split off from the Labour Party) also voted for the national bloc headed by the Conservatives, polling 338,517 votes, so did two groups of Liberals who in the main rallied around the Conservative platform (the group of Herbert Samuel and the group of Simon polled 2,003,483 votes), and finally a few independent candidates who polled 85,238 votes. In all, 14,299,720 votes were cast for the Conservative-National bloc. Of the opposition parties the Labourites secured 6,617,108 votes, the Liberals (Lloyd George's group) 316,827 votes, Mosley's Party 35,916, the Independents 256,848. All in all the Liberal-Labourite opposition polled 7,226,499 votes.

Thus the Conservative bloc succeeded in securing twice as many votes as the opposition. When comparing the number of seats won, the victory of the Conservatives was even more telling. They received nine times as many seats in Parliament as the opposition. This victory was gained because, differing from the elections of 1929, the Liberals did not run against the Conservatives, did not split their votes, but showed a united front against the candidates of the Labour Party. Whereas in 1929 in 102 electoral districts there were only two candidates each and two competing parties—(in other districts, candidates of three or more parties were competing),—in 1931 the candidates of the Labour Party had only one opponent put up by the National bloc, in each of 400 districts; in 313 instances this rival candidate was a Conservative, in 87 cases he was a Liberal.

3. THE BEGINNING OF POLITICAL DIFFERENTIATION WITHIN THE ENGLISH WORKING-CLASS.

The Conservatives achieved a brilliant parliamentary victory over the Labour Party. In comparison with 1929 the number of seats in Parliament held by the Conservatives increased from 261 to 470, and those of the Labour Party decreased from 288 to 51. Thus the immediate parliamentary task which the Conservatives had set themselves, was accomplished by them. But we have already mentioned that the Conservatives were aiming much further, that while attacking the Labour Party they, in the last analysis, were not after the Labour Party, but after the working-class, trying to disorganise its ranks. Have the Conservatives achieved this purpose, this ulterior goal? Not by any means. To the superficial observer the victory of the Conservatives at the polls appeared as a flat contradiction of the upsurge in the Labour movement which was evident on the eve of the election in the stormy demonstrations of the unemployed and in the revolt of the English sailors. In reality, there is no contradiction between these two facts. Only an observer suffering from "dizziness from success" who, therefore, could not clearly see the stage of development of the English labour

movement as signalised by the demonstrations of the unemployed, and could not understand the dialectics of the development of the English labour movement, could make out a case of a contradiction between the election victory of the Conservatives and the rise of the labour movement in England on the eve of the elections.

From the very beginning of the imperialist epoch, since the beginning of the decline and decay of British imperialism, we could observe important economic mass struggles of the English proletariat. We were witness to the climax of this movement, which expressed itself in the general strike of 1926. But this very strike showed wherein the main weakness of the English labour movement lies. The English proletariat unanimously went out on strike in 1926, but the movement was headed by the reformists with the intention of betraying it. The defeat of the general strike showed conclusively that the further development of the English labour movement and the entry of the proletariat on the road to revolution depends on a split in its ranks, a demarcation between the upper strata of the working-class with its political representatives, and the bulk of the working-class, i.e., depends on a political differentiation within the English working-class. This differentiation (*vide* the terrific struggle between the Bolsheviks and the Mensheviks) was a necessary pre-requisite for the victory of the proletarian revolution in Russia. This same struggle (between the Communists and the Social-Democrats) was a necessary pre-requisite for the development of a mass revolutionary movement in the continental countries of Europe. England is no exception in this respect. Her proletariat enters this path of differentiation a bit late due to the long monopoly position held by the English capitalists and, in connection with this, due to the bourgeois corruption of the English proletariat, which even Engels spoke of long ago.

If we approach the last English elections from this point of view, we can see that they do not denote a retreat of the working-class, but on the contrary, they, like the militant demonstrations of the unemployed that preceded them, represent the first steps towards this differentiation so necessary for future victories. This differentiation expresses itself in the fact that the upper privileged strata of the working-class openly join the bourgeois reaction, while the basic masses of the working-class are looking for the real revolutionary road to socialism, though they are still far from it.

We say that these are the *first steps* on the road to differentiation, because the organisation of a "Labour Party," although already signifying the beginning of the realisation by the workers of their special class interests and the beginning of their demarcation from the frankly bourgeois parties, did not yet march under the banner of socialism and was not yet

followed by a demarcation within the working-class itself. The Communist Party likewise has not yet reached the wider masses of the working-class, inasmuch as the English Communist Party is not yet a mass party.

How large was the part of the working-class which openly joined the bourgeois reaction at the last elections or temporarily leaned towards the leadership of MacDonald, towards the Conservatives who had promised them a way out of the crisis and unemployment through protectionism? The election statistics point this out sufficiently clearly.

The Conservatives gained 3,208,239 votes. This number apparently includes the 2,980,633 votes lost by the Liberals which, according to their social composition, are votes of the middle and petty bourgeoisie. The remaining gains of the Conservatives—227,606 votes—are obviously votes of workers and partly petty-bourgeois who left the ranks of the Labour Party. Besides these 227,606 votes, the Labour Party also lost 338,517 votes that went to the National Labourites who severed connections with the Labour Party and followed MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas, who virtually joined the camp of the Conservatives. Thus, over half-a-million workers endorsed the Conservatives and National Labourites. We must also take note of the social composition of these workers. Even now it can already be said with some degree of certainty that those were votes of the labour aristocracy who feared the loss of their savings and who believed that the Conservatives were the only ones to save the gold standard of the pound sterling. Partly, they were also votes of Labour aristocrats or extremely backward workers who hoped that the protectionist and colonial policy of the Conservatives would strengthen English industry and save them from the danger of becoming unemployed and being thrown out on the streets. Such, approximately, is the relatively small part of the working-class which at the present juncture joined the camp of the counter-revolutionists. On the other side of the fence we find the bulk of the working-class and the remainder of the labour aristocracy: 6,617,108 votes cast for the Labour Party, about 200,000 votes cast for the "Independent Labour Party" and about 1,000,000 citizens whose votes were formerly cast for the Labour Party but who abstained from voting this time. (In all, 21,500,000 votes were cast in 1931 as against 22,500,000 in 1929. If we add this million abstentionists to the 227,000 who joined the Conservatives and the 338,000 who followed MacDonald, we shall get exactly the 1,500,000 which the Labour Party lost at these elections.)

The Communists will be discussed separately.

What is the political belief of the million workers who formerly voted for the Labour Party but who now had abstained from voting, and of those 6,500,000

voters who now cast in their lot with the Labour Party as a party of opposition, and also the 200,000 votes which were cast for the Independent Labour Party? As regards the first category of voters, they are apparently workers disappointed in the Labour Party, who have lost all illusions at least about the present Parliament, but who have not yet found the road to Communism, nor understood that besides opportunist parliamentarism there is also a revolutionary parliamentarism. But the bulk of the English working masses who voted for the Labour Party and for the Independents is obviously not of the same state of mind as at former elections. Naturally the Labour Party remains a bourgeois party as before. Naturally, the Labour and Independent Labour Parties remain the main social support of the bourgeoisie. But the state of mind of the workers who followed them at the last elections has changed, has become so radical that these parties were forced to resort to many "left" demagogical manoeuvres in order to retain their hold on the working masses, a thing they did not find necessary in 1929.

In order to retain their influence over the working masses, the Labour Party formally had to go into opposition to the "National Government," had to expel its former leaders, MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas, from the Party, at least during the election campaign, had to call them traitors and renegades, had to mention in its election platform the fact that "the capitalist system went bankrupt even in the countries where its authority seemed most firmly entrenched," had to speak about the National Government "now looking for a mandate from the electorate to realise the unrealisable task of restoring capitalism," had to say that "socialism is the only way out of anarchic competition," had to promise "an expansion of public undertakings," had to promise "a change from the chaotic individualistic enterprises to co-ordinated, planned economy," had to promise to "subject the banks and the entire credit system to public control," had to promise "the reorganisation of the main branches of industry, such as transport, iron manufacturing, the steel industry and public utilities of national interest," had to promise to re-establish the rights of the trade unions of which they had been deprived in 1927; to get back the unemployment relief for the unemployed, payment of which had been stopped by the National Government, etc., etc. The election platform of the "Independent Labour Party" which executed an additional "left" manoeuvre by nominating its candidates independently of the Labour Party, was drawn up in still more "leftist" demagogical terms. The "Independents" uttered "left" phrases such as "We are driving the last nails into the coffin of capitalism," the "theory of the gradual change to socialism has suffered bankruptcy," we "demand the dictatorship of the proletariat" (of course not

through a proletariat revolution, but "through winning of a majority in Parliament"!!). Even if we did not know the treacherous deeds of these parties, but only read through their platform carefully, we would be convinced without any difficulty that they are nothing but a tissue of lies and deceit. We would be convinced without any difficulty that if they received an absolute majority in Parliament they would not only not realise their own demands, as they were promising, but that these demands, in their essence, did not aim at the establishment of socialism, but at the rehabilitation of capitalism.

This is quite obvious to us. But the great majority of the English proletariat has not yet heard our Communist criticism of this social demagoguery. Moreover, the English proletariat, in contradistinction to the proletariat of the European continent, has no Social-Democratic not to speak of Marxist traditions, and, in that connection, did not have the opportunity to observe to the same degree as the continental proletariat how the Social-Democrats and their leaders prostitute the word socialism. The English Labour Party until recently, did not even adopt the banner of socialism. Only the Independent Labour Party from the very beginning preached socialism, but of the "constructive Christian" variety. Therefore we can say with certainty that the English proletariat, in voting for the Labour Party, sincerely thought that now, after the palpable traitors, MacDonald and Co., had been thrown out of the Labour Party and after it began to bandy the world socialism about, it really was on the road to the emancipation of the working-class from capitalist slavery. We are safe in saying that the vast majority of votes cast for the Labour Party and the Independent Labour Party were votes of workers moving to the "left," but still honestly groping about to feel their way; that the differentiation in the English working-class has already begun and that even now the Communist Party, on the basis of this differentiation, can gather in a rich harvest among the English working-class, and become a mass party through the skilful exposure before the masses of the false demagogic manoeuvres of the Labourites and the I.L.P.

4. WEAKNESSES AND PROBLEMS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.

The English Communist Party has doubled its membership during the last few months. Due to the fact that £150 sterling had to be deposited for each candidate, our Party could put up candidates in only twenty-five election districts out of 615, and in these districts it received 75,000 votes, that is, one-and-a-half times as many as in the past elections. But this cannot be called a success by any means. Despite the fact that the number of votes cast for our

Party increased 50 per cent., the absolute number of votes cast was so insignificant and so incommensurate with the unusually favourable objective situation that to call this success would be deceiving ourselves. No matter how small the membership of our Party was when entering the election campaign, and no matter how small the number of districts in which our Party put up candidates, we had the right to expect that our Party would receive several times as many votes as at former elections. Our Party must seriously consider why the election campaign produced such insignificant, such puny results. We will have further occasion to discuss this question specially, when we know concretely how the elections were prepared and carried out by our Party. But even now we can point to a number of weak spots brought out by our Party both before and during the election campaign.

Just before the elections our Party succeeded in leading large demonstrations of unemployed in a number of localities. This was undoubtedly a great success for our small English Party. For the first time in the many years after the General Strike our Party thus succeeded in establishing direct contact with masses, in this case, with the masses of the unemployed. However, even this success we must soberly evaluate. For one thing, according to eye-witnesses and even according to the bourgeois Press, the unemployed of England are now in such a militant frame of mind that it was sufficient for our Party members or members of the unemployed councils under the influence of our Party to call the unemployed out into the street, even without any special preparation and a demonstration would take place which would grow spontaneously like an avalanche. Secondly, the members of our Party, who headed the demonstrations of the unemployed, did not take sufficient care to see that the unemployed understood that the men who lead them did not represent merely a personal leadership sympathising with the unemployed, but the leadership of the Communist Party. As a result, it often happened that at the elections infinitely fewer votes were cast for our candidate than the number of unemployed who had participated in the demonstrations under the leadership of our comrades.

But, even granted that our Party succeeded in establishing contact with the unemployed movement, though in a limited, personal form, it absolutely failed to establish any contacts in industry on the eve of the elections. It also worked very poorly in the reformist trade unions. In the face of a complete absence of preparatory work among the working masses in industry, it was naturally difficult for our Party, during the short period of the election, to find an approach to these masses, particularly since it displayed such utter helplessness in organising the election campaign itself.

As a matter of fact, no central political leadership

was noticeable during the election. No propaganda was carried on nor were any election organisations formed. The members of our Party confined their activities to speaking at election meetings, which were fairly well attended by workers. Although the workers listened to our speakers very eagerly, this could not by any means forecast the outcome of the elections in the locality in question, for meetings, as is well known, are attended by only a small part of the electorate. No propaganda was conducted in the homes, there were no posters, no stickers or other similar means of influencing the masses.

Besides this fundamental defect—the inability to establish contact with the wide masses—our Party made many definite political errors during the election campaign. Our Party apparently correctly carried out the political directives which were worked out during the beginning of the mass movement of the unemployed, in connection with this movement in England. But this by no means relieved it of its duty to remember the general decisions regarding the problems of Communist Parties during every election campaign, as well as the political decisions of the Eleventh Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. It must be borne in mind that if, at any time, a new, partly political task is pushed to the fore, it is thus advanced not in order to change the general directives previously worked out, but in order to carry them out. As far as can be judged by the first information received on the election campaign, our Communist Party did not adequately grasp that idea.

First of all, our Party did not show its *political* face sufficiently. There were instances when a candidate of our Party addressed himself to the masses as a man personally well known to the workers of the district, instead of as a representative of the Communist Party. But we Communists, in accordance with our principles, ask voters to vote not for personalities, but for the Party. This was the first mistake.

Secondly, our Party, having seen the necessity of striking hardest at the Social-Democrats during the election campaign, did so in a manner at variance with the decisions of the Eleventh Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, which did not help to attract the sympathies of the workers to our Party. The Eleventh Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International had emphasised that our *primary class enemy* is the bourgeoisie and that the Social-Democracy is the *main social support of the bourgeoisie*. In accordance with this our struggle against Social-Democracy cannot be separated from the struggle against our chief enemy, but must be closely connected with it. Our English Communist Party, in directing its main attack against the Labour Party, did not make it clear that it was the Communist Party

itself that was making this attack, that the Labour Party, despite its demagogic “socialist” platform, or rather because of this platform which deceives the working-class and lulls them to sleep, rendered valuable assistance to the English bourgeoisie, represented by the Conservatives and the National bloc, the chief enemies of the working-class, the Party that was leading the general attack against the working-class. The workers who had already realised that the Conservatives were their worst and most irreconcilable enemies, but who had not yet grasped the idea that the Labour Party was deceiving them and supporting the Conservatives, could not understand our struggle against the Labour Party without getting a simple explanation of the close, intimate connection between the “left” demagogic manoeuvres of the Labourite-Independents and the general attack on the working-class carried on by the Conservatives.

Third, there have been repeated international decisions that the “left” Social-Democrats are most dangerous for us and that we must unsparingly expose the “left” Social-Fascists, who, with their phrasemongering, aim to distract the working-class from the revolutionary struggle, as the most dangerous enemies of the working-class. Despite this our Party permitted joint meetings to be held with the Maxton group, and at these meetings our comrades did not fight Maxton and his crew and did not draw any clear line between our Party and theirs.

Fourth, our Party in exposing the demagogic platform of the Labour Party and of the Independent Labour Party and in offering up our Communist platform with its revolutionary solution of the crisis instead, lost sight of the directives of the Eleventh Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International which declared that in every country it is necessary to approach the proposition of a revolutionary solution of the crisis concretely, taking into account the peculiarities of the given country and the peculiar prejudices which make it difficult for the working-class to come over to our side. At the Eleventh Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International it was pointed out particularly that the English workers are frightened away from revolution by their belief that in case of revolution in the colonies, England would be cut loose from the base of supply of its provisions and raw materials, and that the workers of England would thus be doomed to starvation.

At the Eleventh Plenum of the Executive Committee of the Communist International it was shown how these arguments of the Social-Democrats who have sold themselves to the bourgeoisie could and should be parried: that if the English proletariat should actively support the revolutionary movement in the colonies it would thereby insure future Soviet England of a close brotherly bond with future Soviet

India and other Soviet countries. These instructions of the Eleventh Plenum were also not taken advantage of during the election campaign in which our Party failed to propagate its principle on a befittingly lofty plane. Our Party is guilty of many mistakes and omissions before and during the elections, which were bound to result in a rather unfavourable outcome of the elections for us. But it is not too late to correct these errors even now, for the objective situation in England is even more favourable after the election than before in so far as our enemies have now exposed themselves. It is sufficient to point out that the English Conservatives who conducted the election campaign primarily with the slogan of putting the pound sterling back to par, thus attracting the votes of the petty bourgeois masses who trembled for their savings in case of a crash of the pound, have not the slightest intention now to take up that problem because the partial devaluation of the pound sterling makes competition of English industry on the

world market easier, but rather strain every effort to lower the standard of living of the working-class. Suffice it to point out that the Labour Party, which prided itself before the workers on the fact that it is now the opposition, immediately after the elections, in fact the very next day, let it be known in an editorial in the "Daily Herald" that it would give all proposals of the Government its "careful consideration, agreeing to support those which should be in the interests of the nation."

The objective situation in England is very favourable for us. Our Party must with all possible speed and energy begin to study, to acquaint itself with and to correct the mistakes made before and during the election, mistakes traceable to general lack of knowledge of Leninism. Only in that event can we hope that when the situation in England will become still more acute, and the English working-class will be waging its big battles, it will be possessed of a leadership that will lead it to victory.

MR. ROY IN THE SERVICE OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM AND THE NATIONAL CONGRESS

HEADED by Gandhi, the leaders of the National Congress — Nehru, Bose and Mehta, who dissolved the "Meerut Prisoners' Defence Committee," who gave their consent to the imprisonment of thousands of revolutionaries in Anglo-Indian prisons, and left them to suffer a lingering death, have now launched an energetic campaign in defence of Roy. This support has a class basis.

The Indian bourgeoisie, headed by the National Congress, in its compromise with British Imperialism, is trying all it can to disorganise and to keep in check the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants. Besides direct terror on the part of British imperialism, which is called into action by the national-reformists every time the toiling masses attempt an armed uprising (Kishoreganj and so on), the Indian bourgeoisie spares no efforts to disorganise the revolutionary movement from within to keep back the growth of the revolutionary, class-consciousness of the working masses, and to hinder the formation of a Communist Party of India.

The XI. Plenum of the E.C.C.I. marked a new stage in the development of the process of differentiation in the National liberation movement of India, and indicated that in the circumstances, which had arisen after the session of the National Congress in Karachi, the emancipation of the working class from the influence of the bourgeoisie had gone forward at a more rapid rate. The fact that the broad masses of toilers

had now entered into the political struggle compelled the National Congress to increase its efforts a hundredfold in order to maintain the leadership of the national movement.

In order to achieve this task, the National Congress held its Congress in Karachi under the slogan of "defending" national interests, and passed its bourgeois "Declaration of Rights," which it is now trying to make out as almost a Socialist document. In order to strengthen its leadership, the National Congress began to talk a lot about its chief task being to defend the interests of the peasantry (actually, of course, the landlords), and, finally, considerably developed its activities among the workers. The National Congress recently passed a resolution calling upon the factory owners to grant "concessions" to the workers; further, in several places committees for work among the workers have been formed, and Congress mediators between the workers and owners have begun to take part in several strikes who call themselves the workers' friends, but who in actual fact are disorganisers and enemies of the working class movement. This increased activity on the part of the National Congress has become characteristic during the last few months, and represents the conscious effort of the bourgeoisie to disorganise the proletariat and to subject the workers entirely to their policy.

However, the forces of the National Congress and its programme are clearly inadequate, especially for the purpose of demoralising the more

advanced sections of the proletariat and of preventing the creation of a Communist Party. The "left" wing of the National Congress, headed by Bose, Nehru and Mehta, etc., is also an inadequate force, as the experience of the class struggle in India shows clearly.

Now, this task of the Indian bourgeoisie for the disorganisation of the proletarian vanguard, the advanced sections of the working class, has fallen to the lot of the Roy group, the agency of the Indian bourgeoisie inside the working class movement, whose activity (Roy's group) of late has taken on a serious form.

The Roy group with Sheik, Kabadi, V. N. Joshi and others, organised a split in the Girni Kamgar Union and during the "Labour Week" campaign, organised by the National Congress in Bombay during the summer of 1930, came out with the slogan: "Workers and peasants are the arms and legs of the National Congress."

During the whole course of their activities, as well as during the Calcutta session of the National Congress, Roy and Co. called upon the workers to support the National Congress and to refuse to tolerate any form of criticism against the so-called "lefts"—Bose, Nehru and others.

In the summer of 1931, Mr. Roy and Co., with Mehta and Ruikar, amalgamated with the down-right agents of British capital—Joshi, Giri, Shiva Rao — and formed a reactionary so-called unity committee to split the trade union movement. Then, fulfilling the general plan of the bourgeois National Congress, which was mentioned by Bose in his speeches during and after the Calcutta Trade Union Congress, Roy, Kandalkar, Sheik and Co., together with Bose, Ruikar and other national reformists, split the Congress in order to isolate the revolutionary vanguard and disorganise the growing class unity of the proletariat, which was entering more and more into active strikes and political warfare.

The disorganising work of the Roy-Kandalkar-Sheik group was shown in several strikes and is now particularly evident in the disorganising of the mobilisation of the railway workers for a general strike. Ruikar, in alliance with the Roy group, is energetically striving to prevent any true militant unity among the workers and once more instead of preparing for a strike, is advocating, and taking part in, an Arbitration Committee, in order to gain time, to prevent the strike and to defeat the workers section by section.

It is quite clear, therefore, why the bourgeoisie and the National Congress are offering them their most hearty support.

In the existing alignment of class forces, where

the bourgeoisie, headed by the National Congress, is doing its utmost to prevent an anti-imperialist, agrarian revolution, and the working class has begun to free itself from the influence of the bourgeoisie, to organise the Communist Party and develop the strike movement, with the widely-developed agrarian and peasant movement as its background (the Burma uprising, etc.)—the Indian bourgeoisie is using the group of Roy, who was long ago expelled from the ranks of the Communist International, as its agent in the work of disorganising the revolutionary movement of workers, peasants and revolutionary youth. In playing its part as the agent of the exploiting classes within the labour movement, the Roy group, with its "revolutionary" phrases and supported by the entire bourgeois-landlord apparatus (the press, etc.), enjoying favourable treatment at the hands of the English gaolers—carries on treacherous work to prevent the creation of a powerful Communist Party and to disorganise the coming Indian revolution.

Mr. Roy took up his treacherous position against the strict line and the decisions of the Communist International, swearing allegiance to Communism in *words*, but later appearing *openly* against it in *deeds*, and was for this reason expelled from the ranks of the International in 1929 as a traitor to the Indian liberation movement and the world proletarian revolution.

In order that the broad masses of workers and peasants should more easily understand the demagogic deceit of Mr. Roy, it would be as well to give a short estimation of Roy's position on Indian questions.

ROY'S IDEA OF THE ROLE OF THE INDIAN PROLETARIAT IN THE NATIONAL LIBERATION REVOLUTION

The estimation given by the Roy group of the class forces in India is diametrically opposed to the position of the Comintern, according to which the working class and the peasantry, together with the town poor (among whom the leading and organising rôle is beginning and will be played by the proletariat, headed by the Communist Party) are the driving forces of the Indian revolution. Moreover, the proletariat fights for this leading rôle, not in alliance with, but on the contrary in the struggle *against* the treacherous bourgeoisie and all its reformist detachments, especially the "lefts." And yet the whole policy and activity of the Roy group aims at *reducing the proletariat to the position of a feeble appendage of the bourgeoisie.*

The Roy conception and estimation of class forces and the tactic he propounds are of a

national-Menshevik character. This is most clearly shown in the fact that the proletariat is given the rôle of left flank of the *united* national-bourgeois front. The Roy group faces the proletariat with the task of merely criticising the "wavering" of the bourgeoisie and bringing pressure to bear through its "left" wing. This is obviously a treacherous position.

The Indian bourgeoisie, writes Mr. Roy in his article from the Cawnpore prison on August 23, was "urged" by British imperialism to "capitulate"; moreover, in view of the provocative actions of the Government, Roy complains: "Congress was compelled again and again to postpone the journey of Gandhi to London. The responsibility falls upon MacDonald for the fact that the Indian people, against their will, are having a sham scheme of "self-government" forced upon them. Thus, Mr. Roy even now entirely lifts the responsibility from the shoulders of the Indian bourgeoisie and the National Congress for their betrayal of the national-revolutionary movement and is trying to convince the nation that the bourgeoisie is prepared to fight against British Imperialism.

The proletariat, according to Roy and Co., has only to bring pressure to bear upon the bourgeoisie and remain within the framework of a united front and a united organisation, i.e., submit completely to the leadership of the treacherous bourgeoisie. Roy and Co. therefore urge the workers to follow the National Congress, to support the so-called "lefts"—Nehru, Bose and others—and "win over" the National Congress from within. Therefore, Roy and Co., for instance, have issued the slogan of a Constitutional Assembly and have declared themselves strongly against the general strike and the independent programme of the working class. The Indian bourgeoisie through its National Congress and Gandhi has entered into negotiations with British imperialism concerning the conditions upon which they can mutually exploit the Indian people. The "left" wing of the National Congress, representing an organic part of the latter and pretending to be a quasi-opposition *in words*, actually pursues the policy of the National Congress, whereas Mr. Roy and Co., in mildly criticising occasionally the fact that the Congress leaders participate in the negotiations with British imperialism, call for support of the united front with the "Left" Wing of the National Congress—Nehru, Bose and Co.

In this way Roy is working hand-in-hand with the bourgeoisie in fooling the people and disorganising the revolutionary struggle. In this betrayal the most dangerous rôle is played by the "left" groups, together with Roy and Co., whose real treachery is more difficult for the people to

understand, because Roy even now tries to masquerade in the name of the Communist International.

THE NATIONAL-BOURGEOIS PARTY INSTEAD OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Roy and his supporters, playing their part as the agent of the exploiting classes within the working class movement, endeavour to gloss over the bourgeois character of the National Congress and the treacherous rôle of the "left" national reformists—Nehru, Bose and Co.

Roy and his supporters, forced to take into account the disillusionment of the people in connection with the treacherous policy of the National Congress, and in order to strengthen the position of national-reformism, have suggested the formation of a national "revolutionary," actually national-bourgeois, party, and are fighting determinedly against the independent proletarian party—the Communist Party.

In his book, *Future of Indian Politics*, he proposes:—

"Convert the Swaraj Party (a bourgeois Party which was in favour of participating and collaborating in the arbitrary legislative assemblies introduced by the English after the 1919-22 movement—Editor's note) into a national revolutionary party of the people. The first event in the future of Indian politics will be the crystallisation of such a party." (Page 99.)

Thus Mr. Roy proposes the conversion of the treacherous bourgeois party of the Swarajists into a so-called National Revolutionary Party.

In 1930 Mr. Roy and his supporters in a manifesto signed by the international Right renegade Brandler group, which was expelled from the Comintern, declared:

"The National Congress was very useful in the period of agitation and propaganda. But it could not act as a political party aiming at true struggle. Consequently the task of the movement is the creation of a national-revolutionary party."

Thus, seeing that the people have begun to discover the bourgeois character of the National Congress, whose treacherous activities Mr. Roy is continually justifying—the Roy group (whose open transition to the side of national-reformism took place side by side with the growth of class consciousness among the proletariat and the deepening of class differentiation), in order to consolidate the leading position of the bourgeoisie and to deceive the masses, once more puts forward the idea of creating a national-revolutionary party, i.e., actually of creating a national-bourgeois party, whose task it will be

to strengthen the influence of the bourgeoisie by means of radical phrases and promises.

The group of Roy serve the purpose of spreading the counter-revolutionary influence of the bourgeoisie above all in the ranks of the town petty-bourgeoisie and partially among more backward strata of workers.

It fights for the political hegemony of the bourgeoisie against the proletarian vanguard and especially against the creation of the Communist Party, which represents a serious threat to National Reformism in the arena of the mass movement. Wholly and completely carrying out the policy of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie it operates on the basis of their immediate support and the counter-revolutionary tendencies of the town petty-bourgeois heads, enemies of the mass revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants.

Precisely because of this social and political basis it endeavours to realise its splitting reactionary national-reformist influence upon the lower petty-bourgeoisie and the workers.

ROY AND CO. AGAINST THE HEGEMONY OF THE PROLETARIAT IN THE NATIONAL MOVEMENT

The Roy-Sheik group is against the working class and its programme for the Indian revolution. According to Roy and Co. the proletariat has no right to fight for the rôle of leader of the Indian people or to make propaganda under its own fundamental slogans. *The working class, in the opinion of Roy and Co., should drag along behind, and not question the leading position of the treacherous bourgeoisie and its political organ, the National Congress.* In an open letter to the Bombay workers the Roy-Sheik-Kandalkar group proposes that they:

"Fight only for partial demands, as it is pure *romanticism* to talk about a general strike . . . and to put forward the slogan of a workers' and peasants' government."

The Communist Party of India in *actual practice*, and not merely in words, participates in the daily strike struggles of the working class (Bombay, Sholapur, the G.I.P. railway, etc.), and in its Platform of Action it made quite clear its attitude to the question of the struggle for partial demands. The Roy-Sheik-Kandalkar group had to use this lying accusation against the Indian Communist Party about underestimating the struggle for partial demands, merely in order to hide up its own "hqvstist" Menshevik position, to deprive the workers of a programme of fundamental demands, which would express the hopes of the people of the land and, *on the basis of which the proletariat is fighting and will fight for*

hegemony in the National Movement, under the flag of which the Indian Revolution will develop. Mr. Roy and his supporters declare that questions of power, of the agrarian revolution, of independence and so on are no business of the working class, but must be left entirely to the bourgeois National Congress; Roy and Co., who are frequently ready to swear allegiance to the leading rôle of the proletariat, actually fight against all real measures to bring about proletarian leadership. That is why they are so bitterly attacking the slogan of a general strike, which has such significance for the development of the revolutionary movement, especially at the present moment. Hence the constant leit-motif of all the propaganda made by Roy and the bourgeois Congress, with its accusations against the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade unions: of "ultra-radicalism," "sectarianism," "Moscow dictatorship," and so on. This accusation is hurled out in an equal measure because the Red trade unions and the Communist Party are fighting determinedly not only for general political demands, but also in the everyday economic struggle, leading strikes *in the spirit of the class struggle*, struggling against all reformist traitors and disorganisers of workers' strikes (for example, the betrayals of Ruikar, Joshi and so on in the railwaymen's strike on the Great Indian Peninsular Railway).

The negotiations carried on by the Roy-Sheik-V. N. Joshi group with the Bombay Committee of the National Congress, published in the "Bombay Chronicle" of September 28, are an example of the way in which they "struggle" for partial demands, trying to convert the proletariat into an appendage of the bourgeoisie. The Congress paper writes: A meeting took place between the representatives of Congress Committee, Messrs. Brelvey, Nariman and others, and the leaders of the Tramwaymen's Union, Messrs. Lalji Pendse, V. N. Joshi and others (representatives of the Tramwaymen's Union—supporters of the Roy group), at which Lalji Pendse and Joshi asked the National Congress to "fulfil its obligations before the workers" and help to secure the demands of the tramwaymen. In reply the Congress representative said that he is prepared to assist "in order to avoid a probable catastrophe," i.e., prevent the men from striking. This is an example of the "class" policy of the Roy group, which amounts to subjecting the workers to the leadership of a bourgeois National Congress, and together with the latter demoralising and disorganising the strike struggle. The policy of the Roy-Kandalkar-Sheik-Joshi group amounts to the same thing in all the struggles of the textile workers and others. All their dis-

organising work in conjunction with Ruikar among the railwaymen amounts to this as well. Hence they make use of the support of the bourgeoisie, hence the Association of Owners recognises them and negotiates with them. For they are the lackeys and agents of the bourgeoisie within the ranks of the proletariat.

A POWERLESS CONSTITUTIONAL ASSEMBLY VERSUS THE REVOLUTION

The treacherous bourgeois character of the Roy-Sheik group is obvious further from the programme of action it has launched before the toiling masses of the land. In Roy's declaration of June 8, 1930, published in Berlin and reprinted in India, again mainly repeated in the appeal of Sheik, Kabadi and Bradjesha Sing, published in the "Vanguard" in Bombay, and in other documents as well, we read:

"The central political slogan of the Indian revolution should be the *election of a Constituent Assembly*, as against the round table conference, on the one hand, and against the utopia of a Soviet Republic, on the other . . . "

and further:

"The local Congress Committee broadened through the inclusion of the delegates from the workers, peasants, small traders . . . organisations should become the units for the election of the Constituent Assembly."

Thus, supported by the British army, Roy and Co. propose the creation of an "organ of democratic power," which will bring about "independence," "for the sovereign authority of the constituent assembly cannot be doubted." (Page 12, "Vanguard" and "The People" of January 22, 1931.) It should be clear to every worker and peasant that the idea of a *constituent assembly is for the purpose of disarming the masses, preventing the agrarian revolution, consolidating the domination of British Imperialism, clearing the way for constitutional "reforms" and glossing over the simple truth that India can obtain independence, only by means of a revolutionary rising.*

The proposal of the Roy group is an attempt to consolidate the authority of the National Congress by giving it the new name of Constituent Assembly and swelling the ranks of its members by further deceitful efforts to subject the toiling masses to the leadership of the predatory bourgeoisie.

Roy's constituent assembly is the same old congress, with its same old counter-revolutionary bourgeois programme, bourgeoisie leadership, only under another name.

That is why the "lefts," Nehru, Bose and Co.,

are supporting Roy's constituent assembly. And from this it is quite obvious why the bourgeoisie, with Roy and his friends, are so violently opposed to the slogan of an Indian Federal Soviet Workers' and Peasants' Republic, put forward by the Communist Party of India and supported by demonstrations of the workers. *For this slogan of the Communist Party, which means the democratic dictatorship of the working class and peasantry, is essentially directed against imperialism and the treacherous bourgeoisie whom the Roy group defends.*

Roy's democratic constituent assembly actually means not only support of Indian bourgeois domination, but is meant to be a justification for the agreement *between the ruling classes of India and imperialism* as well, an agreement for the mutual exploitation of the Indian people.

The fact that the slogan for a constituent assembly is a piece of treachery is also confirmed by the general attitude taken up by Roy's group towards the question of economic relations between England and India and the present economic policy of British imperialism.

Mr. Roy in his book *Future of Indian Politics* writes:

"What are the cardinal demands of the Nationalist bourgeoisie? Impetus to the industrialisation of the country; fiscal autonomy; protection. All these have been realised incidentally by British imperialism." (Page 44.)

"In practice, protectionism is already in force. Imperialism is driven to it by its own contradictions." ("People," p. 301.)

Thus the Roy group actually asserts that imperialism has taken the road of protectionism and is assisting to develop the forces of production in India and, in consequence, the chief economic contradiction between Colonial India and imperialist England is vanishing. And once this is the case, there is serious ground for collaboration. In these circumstances, according to Roy, there is no need to hold on to the idea of revolution, but every need for playing at convening a constituent assembly, under the defence of British bayonets.

Further, it is no accident that in the programme of Roy there is no condemnation of the National Congress, and that among the seven main points of the programme the slogan "complete State independence of India" is not to be found. (Incidentally Vrajat Sing in his "Appeal for the collection of funds to defend Roy," published in the "People" of August 30, 1931, states that the Roy programme was passed by the Trade Union Congress (?) in Calcutta.)

This is what Roy's treacherous programme and his slogan of a constitutional assembly actually

amounts to in practice, and no oaths of allegiance to the struggle for independence or casual mild criticisms of the leaders of the National Congress, can make things better.

The programme of compromise with British Imperialism is the programme of the bourgeois National Congress which is fighting against the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution. This is the programme which Roy and Co. support.

The programme of the revolutionary proletariat and the Communist Party has nothing in common with this programme. The Communist Party of India like the whole Communist International, is determinedly fighting against British imperialism, which holds the Indian people in slavish subjection and does everything possible to hold back the development of productive forces inside the country. The only way out, which has been correctly indicated in the Platform of Action of the Communist Party of India, is the forcible overthrow of British domination and landlords' ownership of the land by means of a victorious revolution of workers and peasants. *The utterances of Roy and Co. are the words of traitors who are spreading the ideology of Imperialism in the ranks of the National Liberation Movement.*

ROY AND CO. AGAINST THE AGRARIAN REVOLUTION.

Pursuing their bourgeois policy among the proletariat, the Roy-Sheik-Bradjesi Sing group at the same time opposes the agrarian revolution and the complete abolition of feudal survivals.

In their appeal, published in the "Vanguard" (Bombay), these bourgeois "revolutionaries" declared that :

"The abolition of the Native States and landlordism should take place by Decree of a national democratic State, empowering the peasants to confiscate land." (Page 12.).

Further :

"The abolition of peasant indebtedness only in cases where the peasant is in a state of bankruptcy."

This is the maximum programme of the Roy group, of the national-mensheviks who are trying to urge the peasants to put off their agrarian revolution until such time as the "democratic" State, i.e., landlords and capitalists, may kindly think fit to hand over some land to the peasants. The Roy group at most promises to bring about some reforms from above, through the bureaucracy, which actually differ in no respect from the programme of the "Nehru Constitution." This is at a time when, in order that the peasants

should get the land, a revolution must be made from below, which would overthrow the domination of the imperialists and landlords, and, with revolutionary actions on the part of the peasantry and working class, would put the programme of agrarian revolution into operation. However, Mr. Roy in his article of December 20, 1930, in "Gegen den Strom" wrote: "The agrarian revolution must be carried out in stages," i.e., he proposes to hold back the revolutionary fight of the peasantry and betray the struggle for independence. Realising that the peasant movement, despite the advice of the National Congress and Roy to wait a little, is continually developing, the Roy group is now trying to head, i.e., to behead, the movement in separate parts of the country, and in doing so aims at deceiving the masses with its new programme of demands, of which the most important are :

A cut of 75 per cent. in land rent for the duration of the present depression; a lowering of 50 per cent. in the land rent as soon as *normal circumstances have been restored*; conclusion of fixed rent agreements, annulment of peasant indebtedness."

(Vidyarthi letter of June 20, published in "Gegen den Strom," July number).

This programme differs very little from that of the National Congress; for the National Congress also talks about a 50 per cent. drop in land rent and the introduction of fixed rent agreements, though *in actual fact* it is helping the British Government to *collect taxes and the debts of the peasants*. But what is most characteristic of the treacherous position of the Roy group is that in their demands, they accidentally expressed their hope that the "*restoration of normal circumstances*" would soon take place.

This is the meaning of Roy's programme to "bring about the agrarian revolution in stages," i.e., it means that having *promised* the peasantry anything and everything for the time being, during the revolutionary upsurge, it is doing its utmost to *bring about "normal circumstances" for the peasantry*, i.e. to *disorganise the revolutionary struggle of the peasantry, to prevent the agrarian revolution and maintain the existing economic system*. This bourgeois agrarian programme which Roy puts forward has nothing in common with the programme of the Indian Communist Party, which, while doing its best to organise and to lead the partial struggle of the peasantry, in order to develop the agrarian movement as well as the revolutionary education and organisation of the peasantry, clearly and determinedly puts forward at the same time the programme of the agrarian revolution (confiscation of

the land without compensation and its immediate transference to the peasantry through peasant committees, annulment of all debts without compensation, etc.) and mobilises broad masses of peasants under its slogans.

ROY—THE ENEMY OF WORKING CLASS UNITY.

In defending the interests of the bourgeoisie, the Roy-Sheik-Kandalkar-Vidyarthi group is trying as far as possible to bring about a split and demoralise the working class movement, the trade unions and the proletarian vanguard.

With assistance from the leaders of the National Congress, the Roy-Sheik group split the Girni Kamgar Union and the "Trade Union Propaganda Committee" in Bombay, actually advocating affiliation to Amsterdam and Geneva, and finally split the All-Indian Trade Union Congress in Calcutta.

Mr. Vidyarthi, an active leader of the Roy group, in the "People," page 115, declared that the trade union movement has now created a "mighty middle (read reformist) group," associated with Mehta, which includes those who, fighting against the stupidities "of the orthodox Moscowites in the Indian labour movement," nevertheless support (!) "Russian methods" and are sincerely trying to get unity on the basis of true trade unionism . . . and who have worked out a platform, which has been accepted by this middle group, on which to fight against "both extreme wings."

The Roy group is very proud of this achievement and the whole bourgeois press is in agreement and welcomes it. What is the idea of all this "unity?" Roy and Vidyarthi themselves write sufficiently clearly on this point. In the "Revolutionary Age," published in America, Mr. Roy wrote as follows on September 5 in his correspondence on the position of the working class movement in India:

"In the course of a few months a powerful middle group has crystallised on the platform of unity" . . . "and it is not by choice that the right wing (Joshi, Giri, Shiva Rao and others . . . Editor's Note) is moving towards unity on a platform of class struggle. They are being forced to that position" . . . "As a matter of fact, since the conference (the "Unity" Conference in Bombay in the summer of 1931 . . . Editor's Note), the right wing leaders have modified their attitude and have even gone to the extent of showing readiness to liquidate the Federation, provided some concessions be made to them as regards attending the Geneva Conferences. We are prepared to make the concession on this minor issue for the sake of unity on a platform of clear class struggle"; and in

another place Mr. Roy adds that the split at the Nagpur Trade Union Congress took place "on secondary issues."

Thus unity, according to Roy, means unity with the Joshi group, which "supports" the platform of class struggle at the present moment. For anyone at all acquainted with Indian affairs, the falsehood and deceit attached to such a declaration is completely obvious.

The Joshi group are the agents of British Imperialism inside the working class movement, and they have demonstrated this fact during the whole course of their existence; at present they are engaged in disorganising the struggle and the general strike of the railwaymen, at whatever cost. Roy and Vidyarthi have become so insolent, counting upon the credulity of the Indian workers, that their assertion that the Joshi group is prepared to accept the platform of class struggle was not even confirmed by any statement from the latter group. And they were unable to give any such confirmation, for none exists. The Joshi group openly declares itself to be against the class war and strikes. But Mr. Roy needed this lie in order to hide up the fact from the workers that he has passed over to the agents of British imperialism and allied himself with them so as to smash the struggle of the workers and create a united reactionary bloc of all the enemies of the revolutionary proletariat. It is for this reason that the Roy group depicts the Nagpur split as the result of stupidities on the part of ultra-lefts, and declares that the split took place on "secondary issues."

Mr. Roy underestimates the growth of class consciousness among the proletarian vanguard. The workers will quickly understand that the assertions of Roy are declarations of the agents of the bourgeoisie and imperialists. The Nagpur split took place on a fundamental question connected with the interests of the whole nation; the question as to whether to wage war against imperialism and the Whitley Commission or take the road of compromise, to give up the fight for independence and take part in the work of the imperialist Whitley Commission. The struggle for independence is a fundamental, cardinal question for India. And the Roy-Vidyarthi-Sheik group declare that it is a "secondary issue." True, for bourgeois agents, for imperialist agents it is a "secondary issue," but for the workers, the peasants and the revolutionary youth, it is a question of life or death.

Thus "unity" for the Roy group means the amalgamation of all anti-revolutionary forces for the purpose of disorganising the national struggle, for the purpose of splitting the ranks of the proletariat, for the purpose of reducing the prole-

ariat to mere appendages of the treacherous bourgeoisie."

The splitting tactics of the Roy group and its anti-revolutionary nature was shown clearly during the Calcutta Trade Union Congress.

Roy and Co. are very proud of the fact that under their leadership the national-reformist section of the trade union congress broke off from the main body. Brajdesi Sing in his appeal published in "The People," August, 1931, declared that the Trade Union Congress had confirmed the programme that Roy has been advocating for several years, and in connection with which Giri has no serious differences of opinion at all. As an illustration of the position of this section of the National Reformist Congress of Trade Unions we give here the resolution of the Bose-Roy section of the textile workers in Nagpur: "Congress promises to give full support to the demands of the Nagpur Textile Workers' Union formulated on May 1, 1931, and since that date, and calls upon owners immediately to appoint *conciliation boards* for a friendly settlement of the dispute" . . . Roy's loyalty to the class struggle actually means conciliation boards and class collaboration, or, to be more exact, the subjection of the interests of the workers to those of the capitalists. And this is so, at a time when the Sholapur textile workers, led by the proletarian vanguard had entered into a strike. Thus the policy of Roy-Kandalkar and Co. means no more and no less than a blow at the textile workers, no more and no less than the smashing up of their united struggle in the interests of the owners.

The revolutionary trade union movement and the Communist Party of India take up the correct attitude when, *fighting for the creation of true class unity of the proletariat in the factories and workshops during strikes and mass actions*, they unmask the treacherous nature of the national reformists at one and the same time.

The Communist Party of India is absolutely right when it unmasks the Roy group and reveals it as the agents of the bourgeoisie within the working class movement. *The party must continue with its energetic campaign against the Roy group, reveal to the workers the fraudulent character of their promises, which are essentially bourgeois under their "radical" phraseology.* The most fraudulent side of the Roy affair is the oath of allegiance which he swears to Communism and the loyalty he professes for the Comintern. Mr. Roy and Co., compelled to profess their loyalty, because of the complete confidence which the working masses of India feel for the Communist International, at the same time hope to hide up the treacherous disorganising part

they are playing under these loud phrases. It is just for this reason that the Roy group are not against calling themselves Communists, at the same time assuring the national reformists that "Communists" of the Roy type are not Communist supporters of the Comintern, i.e., not supporters of international Communism, but the domestic servants of the Indian bourgeoisie. Roy and Co., by making use of the justified suspicion and indignation of the masses of workers at the foreign oppression of British imperialism, at the same time endeavour to undermine the confidence of the working class in the Soviets, the Comintern, as organisations, foreign to the Indian national interests, which do not understand Indian conditions. Mr. Vidyarthi-Roy in the same article, as also in his manifesto from prison (and in other documents) frequently writes about this. This policy of the Roy Group is nothing but veiled support of British imperialism, the aim of which is to undermine the militant international unity of the world proletariat and the oppressed nations, and to disorganise the common struggle of all toilers against Imperialism. The Communist International everywhere, and on every possible occasion, urges that consideration be taken of local conditions, including conditions in India; but it advocates in India as in other places the necessity of following the principles to be found in international, Marxist, Bolshevik experience gained in the class struggle, since this is the only guarantee of victory for the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution in India.

It is necessary to wage war upon the ideological and practical activities of the Roy group not for the purpose of entering into a discussion with these agents of the exploiting classes, but in order to win over to the Communist Party those workers, peasants and honest revolutionaries, who have fallen victims to the cunning deceit and "radical" phrases of Roy's supporters.

The only programme which represents the interests of the people and points out the road to victory for the Indian revolution is the platform of action of the Communist Party of India.

The Communist Party of India takes the correct stand when it calls upon all workers and peasants to join the *united front under the banner of the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution and to throw out all agents of the bourgeoisie and the National Congress*, who try to disorganise the revolutionary struggle of the toiling masses from within.

Roy and Co. declare that the Communist movement during the past two years has been moving along the downward grade. And yet it is just during these last two years that for the first time there has been created a true Commun-

ist movement in India, which, having made a decisive break with national reformism, came forward with the Bolshevik programme of action. In India a Communist Party is growing up which fights determinedly to win the masses and convert itself into a mass organisation, the true leader of the people. In the day to day struggle, with a tried class programme as its basis, the working class is being forged into one mighty whole, which does its utmost to smash the agents of the bourgeoisie and Imperialism. Hence, the struggle for unity among the proletariat and the fight to unmask the national reformists, and especially the "lefts"—who, according to the trend of development of the situation abroad and at home, may yet make use of new "left" manoeuvres to consolidate their influence among the people and *disorganise* the revolutionary struggle—becomes a question of first-class importance. In reply to all the manoeuvres of those who try to disorganise the revolutionary movement, who are fighting against the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution, *we must fight to obtain class unity among the proletariat, to build up and consolidate mass class-conscious*

trade unions, to create a mighty all-Indian Trade Union Congress, to launch the agrarian revolution in the Indian village, and to organise a mass Communist Party as the only leader of the workers and peasant masses.

Imperialism throughout the world is seeking to disorganise the working class, by using its agents, social-fascists, i.e., by trying to undermine the militant power of the growing proletarian movement.

In India both the native bourgeoisie and imperialism do everything in their power to weaken and disorganise the workers' and peasants' movement from within. The Communist International, for the sake of liberating the Indian people from slavery, poverty and the yoke of the imperialists and feudal landlords, calls upon the workers and peasants to drive out from their ranks all agents of the ruling, exploiting classes, interested only in maintaining the existing régime, and to march forward under the leadership of the Indian Communist Party, side by side with the world revolutionary proletariat, into the struggle for their vital interests, for independence, for land and a workers' and peasants' government.

THE REVOLUTIONARY CRISIS IN CHINA AND THE TASKS OF THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Three main political factors define the position in China to-day: the intensification of the economic crisis to such an extent as to create a national economic catastrophe, the rout of the third anti-Soviet expedition of Chiang Kai-shek by the workers' and peasants' red army in Kiangsi and the intervention of Japanese imperialism in Manchuria. These three events pre-define the prospects for the development of the revolutionary movement in China in the historic period now opening before us.

A most extensive national economic catastrophe has seized the central districts of the land and doomed tens of millions of workers and peasants to intense suffering, to extreme misery and death from hunger or epidemics. A devastating flood has come as an additional blow to the colonial economic crisis, to the robbery of the militarists and constant civil war, the slavish exploitation of the peasantry by parasites, landlords and money-lenders, the open plunder of workers' wages and hours in the factories by the capitalists. The flood came as a result of new, but not insurmountable, natural phenomena; it came as a blow to the people because of the criminal mismanagement of the imperialists and bourgeois-landlord Kuomintang government, which systematically

converted all the revenue collected from taxation for the purpose of repairing and building up the system of irrigation, the complicated system of river dams, etc., into a fund for civil armed warfare and punitive expeditions against the Soviet government of workers and peasants. The flood in China is not a natural calamity; it is a civil calamity, the responsibility for which lies upon the shoulders of the bourgeois-landlord Kuomintang and the imperialist masters of China. The extent of economic devastation caused has not yet been calculated even approximately. According to official information in the valley of the Yangtze-kiang alone 350,000 persons were drowned and 50 million doomed to starvation (*New York Times*, 8-3-31). In the Hupeh province a lake has formed the size of the whole of Scotland; four million homes have been destroyed, 23 million inhabitants deprived of any means of existence (*Times*, 13-8-31). The number of refugees from the three provinces, Honan, Kiangsi and Anhwei, amount to over 25 million (*North China Herald*, 25-8-31). Masses of starving people have streamed into the towns. They are confined in concentration camps. They are dying in the streets of hunger and disease. These hungry, despairing refugees affect both the standard of living of the working

proletariat and lower their already extraordinarily low rate of wages. The destruction of the spring and summer crops over extensive parts of the land is sending up prices of foodstuffs by leaps and bounds, more particularly the price of rice and wheat. The rickshaw-men and coolies, who live on their daily earnings, are already not in a position to buy rice for more than one meal a day (*North China Herald*, 18-8-31). The insufficiency of rice and wheat in China this year amounts to 70 million picules, equal to 850 million dollars. The usurious wheat loan granted to the Nanking government by America will guarantee little more than five million persons from starvation for a period of six months, whereas there are tens of millions of starving people. As a result of the flood the agricultural crisis has developed to an extraordinary degree—has become a veritable agricultural catastrophe. Since it is impossible to drain the soil, to draw off the water which has formed lakes, by means of the primitive agricultural implements at the disposal of the Chinese peasants, it will not be possible to sow the fields in several provinces until six months have passed from the beginning of the flood. In several provinces the peasant farms are completely devastated. In Central China the total area under tea is completely demolished, and in Fukien 70 per cent. of the tea is destroyed. Half the cattle in the province was carried away in the floods, the remainder having been sold in the towns because the pasturelands are under water (*North China Herald*, 19-9-31). The starving peasants are selling their cattle for a mere song, in order to buy rice for food. The destruction of cattle was so great, in fact, that it will be felt for several years to come (*Times*, 12-8-31). In the central districts of China there are frequent cases of cannibalism and slave traffic is on the increase.

The militarists, meanwhile, continue to squeeze their very last means of subsistence from the toiling population. Innumerable new forms of taxation are being introduced. For instance, in the Hupeh and Honan provinces (according to information from the local organisation of the Chinese Communist Party) the following new taxes have been introduced: tax on chimneys, new capitation tax, tax "for the destruction of Communists," tax on doors, shop signs, literary works, tombstones, and so on. In short, there are from 40 to 50 new taxes in these two provinces. The moneylenders are enjoying the feast, enriching themselves at the expense of the devastated peasantry and town poor. There is a strong wave of speculation in food throughout the hunger regions. Gangs of speculators, land lords, moneylenders, and the gentry are living

upon the starvation and poverty of the broad masses of workers, peasants and town poor. Many millions of the working population have absolutely nothing more to lose. The movement of these masses is still spontaneous and unorganised; but as the revolutionary fight for the Soviets goes forward, they are beginning more and more to find in this struggle the way out of the economic disaster and terrible impoverishment.

In these circumstances the workers' and peasants' movement is, nevertheless, winning great victories. The Kuomintang is already not in a position either to suppress the revolutionary movement or to hold it back for any length of time. The Kuomintang and the militarists have suffered terrible losses in their fight against the Soviet regions and the Red Army. For over a year big battles have been taking place in this civil war. The Red Army has grown, and become steeled in the fighting. It has developed into a mighty force. In recent battles it routed 15 divisions of the Chiang Kai-shi troops. In the most recent battles in Kiangsi alone, it seized as many as 20 thousand prisoners, over 15 thousand rifles, five million bullets, over 150 machine-guns, etc. Supported by innumerable detachments of the workers' and peasants' Red guard and the Youth guard, the Red Army has not only begun a counter advance, and occupied new regions upon which the third expedition of Chiang Kai-shi was previously operating (particularly the occupation of Kiang), but it is carrying on an active advance upon the capital of the Kiangsi province — on the town of Nanchang. The Soviet movement has spread to the North. A new Soviet region has been formed in Honan. A movement on behalf of the Soviets has started in Shansi and Shensi. In Kansu and on the borders of Hsin-Tshian the national Dungav (Chinese moslim) rising has again broken out. The movement on behalf of the Soviets is on the upgrade. The relation of forces in several provinces has changed in favour of the workers and peasants, in favour of the workers' and peasants' Red Army; the struggle to spread the Soviet regions over a wider area is now the greatest task—the struggle for all-round Soviet territories. The Soviets and the Red Army, under the guidance of the Communists, have become the chief lever of the new revolutionary wave, the organisers of the revolutionary struggle of the working masses throughout China. Their victories show the revolutionary way out of the crisis to the working masses of Kuomintang China.

The imperialists have now begun open warfare, open intervention against the Chinese people. The occupation of Manchuria by Japanese Im-

perialism is by no means the beginning of the affair.

"Intervention is by no means limited to the invasion of troops, and the invasion of troops by no means comprises the chief characteristic feature of intervention . . . In modern conditions Imperialism prefers to intervene by the organisation of civil war inside the dependent country, by financing the counter-revolutionary forces against the revolution, by offering moral and financial support to its Chinese agents against the revolution." (Stalin: "On the prospects of Revolution in China.")

This was just the position on the eve of open intervention by the Japanese in Manchuria. America's supply of armaments including aeroplanes to Chiang Kai-shi's counter-revolutionary forces; the plans for anti-Soviet Kuomintang expeditions drawn up by German Fascist officers; financial support given to the Chinese bourgeois-landlord counter-revolution by the "Free Nations"; the concentration of over a hundred warships in the river Yangtze-kiang and in Shanghai—all these are clear links in the chain of constant intervention in China by the Imperialist States. International Imperialism to this day allows the Kuomintang Government to maintain an appearance of "insignificant successes" in foreign policy (for instance, the concessions granted in Wei-hai-wei by the English on condition that a military strategical base be maintained there, etc.) in order to facilitate anti-Soviet expeditions on the part of the counter-revolutionary bloc of landlords and the bourgeoisie. At the same time Imperialism has not only maintained, but has strengthened its economic and political position in Kuomintang China. The transition from HIDDEN forms of intervention to OPEN warfare against the Chinese people is now stimulated by the bankruptcy of the Kuomintang (as also of its strongest group) in the struggle against the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolutions, against the Communists, against the workers' and peasants' Soviet Government. The dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and landlords can no longer guarantee to the imperialists the maintenance of their economic and political positions in China. Were it not for the systematic military and financial support given to the Kuomintang fraction of the Imperialist powers, the revolutionary wave of the workers' and peasants' movement would have swept the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and landlords from the face of the earth. Hence the need for a change to more aggressive forms of intervention on a wide scale on the part of the imperialists against the Soviets in China, as a result of the progressive breakdown of the Kuomintang power and considerable

victories on the part of the Soviet movement.

There lies ahead a whole historic period of mighty conflict between the workers' and peasants' movement on the one hand, and the armed forces of international occupation on the other. The most essential feature of the situation in which the revolutionary crisis is developing is the increased part played by international Imperialism as the direct oppressor of China and the most powerful force for suppressing the revolution.

The international proletariat should bear in mind this feature of the present situation, and should do its utmost to prevent widespread imperialist intervention against the Chinese people, against their Soviet Government.

The main task before the Chinese Communist party in circumstances of a sharpening revolutionary crisis is to fight for the expansion of Soviet regions, for the formation of unbroken stretches of Soviet territory; is to fight to further strengthen the workers' and peasants' Red Army and create a Provisional Central Soviet Government, to develop the mass revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants to the utmost in all territories occupied by the Kuomintang; to lead the strike movement of the working class and its red trade unions; to win over the membership of the large reformist Kuomintang trade unions, to develop the broadest possible anti-imperialist movement. The intervention of the Japanese has considerably changed the internal political situation in China; it has weakened the Chiang Kai-shi grouping and the Nanking Government. The anti-imperialist movement in the towns, in its turn, has created favourable soil for the development of mass work by the Communist Party in Kuomintang territories. The complete capitulation of the Kuomintang militarist clique before the Japanese militarists is inevitable in the near future (Wang Ching-wei, one of the "lefts," has already announced himself prepared to enter into direct negotiations with the Japanese); this, in the face of the self-sacrificing efforts which are being made by the Communists, will make still sharper the anti-Kuomintang sword of the anti-imperialist movement. The imperialists can be driven out of China only when the anti-national domination of the Chinese landlords and the bourgeoisie has been overthrown, only when Soviet power has spread throughout China. The workers and peasants can destroy the Kuomintang and overthrow the dictatorship of the landlords and the bourgeoisie only if they successfully develop the anti-imperialist struggle and the fight for the land. There are various forms and methods of arousing the masses to fight for national independence against the annexation of

sections of Chinese territory, against the Kuomintang government of national disgrace and treason, to fight for the workers' and peasants' Soviet Government, for the workers' and peasants' Red Army, as the only force capable of obtaining national liberation from the yoke of foreign imperialism and its Chinese landlord-bourgeois agents. Among these forms of struggle is the organisation of a political, anti-imperialist, strike movement, combining it with the struggle for partial economic demands; the organisation of committees to fight against Imperialism (which committees should be elected from among workers and peasants in every factory, in the streets, in schools, on railways, etc.); the development of the anti-imperialist league organisations; the fight for the right to hold anti-imperialist demonstrations on the streets, etc., etc.

The economic distress and starvation among tens of millions in Central China lays an especial obligation upon the Communist Party. The party must energetically take up the task of organising militant activities among the starving Chinese, among refugees and the unemployed; it must create elected committees for struggle among them, it must link up the movement of the town poor, the workers and the unemployed with the military operations of the Red Army, which are directed towards expanding Soviet territories. The Soviet Government is the only force capable of saving tens of millions of unemployed and starving Chinese from inevitable death. The programme of revolutionary measures which the Soviet Government is already putting into operation, and which, after the victory of the revolution, it will operate throughout China, is a programme which will guarantee the mitigation and then the complete disappearance of all the consequence of the national, economic catastrophe and the crimes of the Kuomintang Government. This programme includes the confiscation of lands and food supplies of the landlords, money-lenders, speculators, counter-revolutionary governmental officials, and the free distribution among the starving population by the Soviets of all food supplies confiscated from the wealthy bourgeoisie and landlords; it includes a relentless fight against speculators, who enrich themselves at the expense of the starving people; it includes the constant control by the peasants and workers over these elements, and the organisation of Soviet co-operatives and a broad range of public works to restore the irrigation system throughout China.

Masses of Chinese toilers, driven to desperation, are ever more and more beginning to take up more intense forms of struggle, for instance: the seizure of food shops in the towns in the territory

of Kuomintang, the distribution of confiscated food supplies and goods of prime necessity locally among the starving and unemployed; the seizure of State warehouses containing rice and wheat, and the stores of speculators, money-lenders and wealthy members of the population, who are profiting by the sufferings of workers and peasants; attacks upon Kuomintang governmental institutions (the Board of Irrigation, the police stations, etc., etc.); the arming of workers, unemployed, town poor and refugees for the fight against police and military terror. The Communists must not close their eyes to these manifestations of popular feeling. They should stand at the head of the movement of all the exploited, of all the oppressed. They should lead the movement to overthrow the political power of the Kuomintang and landlords; they should link up this movement with the revolutionary struggle of the Red Army, always preparing, organising, developing the counter-wave of revolutionary support which must be afforded to the Soviet regions from inside the Kuomintang territories.

The strike struggle of the workers in factories, on railways, in arsenals, etc., still continue to take place to a very considerable extent in a purely spontaneous manner, sometimes under the leadership of the yellow trade unions, the leaders of which betray the interests of the workers. The red trade unions are still, as before, badly linked up with the workers in the factories. The task has not yet been properly launched for winning the members of the yellow trade unions over to the Communist Party. And yet it is clear that the mighty anti-imperialist and anti-Kuomintang movement can be raised to a higher level and organised properly only on the basis of a widely developed strike movement among the working proletariat. It is only the strike struggle and organisation of the working proletariat which can really bring confidence, stability and revolutionary determination to the struggle of the town poor and the movement of the unemployed. Consequently the most urgent work of the Communists in the factories and among members of the mass yellow unions is now more actual than ever before. The most important tasks in the work of the Communists in the towns are to elect strike committees, to get them converted into factory workshop committees after the strike is over, to carry on work in the yellow union clubs, to create common committees of struggle among workers and unemployed, to organise the picketing of works, where the men are on strike, and get the unemployed also to take part in picketing. It is obvious that all the tasks of the Communists directed towards organising various activities among the workers, unemployed, town poor and

starving population, should be linked up with the question of the struggle for the Soviet Government, for the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution, for the national and social liberation of the Chinese people.

We shall now make an examination of the tasks of the Communist Party in the Soviet territories, in close connection with the analysis of the important features of the present stage of the revolutionary movement in China. The characteristic feature of the present revolutionary crisis in China is the fact that the "Soviets grew up out of the agrarian revolution" (see XI E.C.C.I. Plenum resolution).

It can be said on the basis of the practical experience of the revolutionary struggle of the masses that this passes the final sentence upon counter-revolutionary Trotskyism and Chiang Kai-shiism in China.

Indeed, it is not so long ago that Mr. Trotsky in one of his last works, the "Permanent Revolution," wrote:

"In the situation which exists in modern bourgeois countries, even the backward ones which have, however, entered the period of capitalist industry and are bound together by railways and telegraphs—and this includes not only Russia, but also China and India—the peasantry are even less capable of taking the leading, or even an independent political rôle, than in the epoch of the old bourgeois revolutions."

And further on in another place in the same book, we find:

"The relative weight of the agrarian question in China is therefore much less than in Tsarist Russia . . . Correspondingly, the Chinese peasantry can in no way be more capable of independent revolutionary and political struggle for the democratic restoration of the country than the Russian peasantry."

It is quite obvious that behind the denial of any "independent revolutionary and political rôle of the peasantry" Trotsky denies the *revolutionary nature* of the peasant masses, of the poor and middle peasantry, in the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution. This habitual, cunning way Trotskyism has of dragging out Menshevik views was shown up at the time by Comrade Lenin. And here we find that the revolutionary crisis, the mighty wave of workers' and peasants' agrarian revolution in China has completely proved the correctness of the Leninist line taken by the Communist International and the Communist Party in China, which correctly bore in mind the enormous, inexhaustible revolutionary forces of the peasantry, headed and guided by

the heroic working class of China. Under the leadership of the proletariat, the basic masses of the peasantry have found themselves quite capable even within the framework of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, not only of fighting against the landlords, against the gentry, against the militarists, against imperialism, but of attacking the national Chinese bourgeoisie as well, who had become so closely bound up with private ownership of the land, that they had capitulated before the landlords and imperialism. Moreover, in the Soviet regions the proletariat and the poor and middle peasantry, while cleansing the land of all survivals of feudalism, in confiscating the privately-owned land, in distributing it among the coolies, farm labourers, poor and middle peasants, in carrying on a stubborn fight against the money-lenders, at the same time are beginning to turn against the Chinese kulaks. The Chinese kulaks, who are in the majority of cases, members of the semi-feudal strata of society, naturally act as an inimical force; they cling to the old slavish forms of exploitation of the toiling masses, they fight against the liquidation of semi-feudal forms of rent, they defend the land of the petty landlords from confiscation, they do everything they can to arrange that the equitable division of the land be carried out in their own interests and at the expense of the poorer peasants and agricultural workers. In the very process of intensifying agrarian revolution, the poor and middle peasantry stand closer and closer around the proletariat; they are continually leaving the bourgeoisie and the kulaks in the enemy camp. It is this which defines the "independent revolutionary political rôle" of the Chinese peasantry, their inexhaustible revolutionary character.

The Kuomintang counter-revolution, having experienced heavy defeats, is beginning to understand the lessons of the agrarian revolution, which are too difficult for the thick-headed Trotskyists and Chen Du-Sui-ists. The Decree of the Chiang Kai-shi military and political leadership of the armies which are fighting against the Soviet movement in Kiangsi (in which the landlord-bourgeois counter-revolution has promised to cancel the indebtedness on taxation for recent years, postpone the payment of taxes for a year, and so on, in regions where the "Red bandits" have already carried out "equitable distribution of the land) is a by-product of the agrarian revolution. It is quite obvious, however, that the Kiangsi peasantry long ago ceased to believe in the countless false promises made by the Kuomintang, and led by the workers and peasants Red Army replied to this by routing the Third expedition of Chang Kai-shi against the Soviets.

The defeat of the Kuomintang armies is now

possible only if the "Right-leftist" line of Li Li-san, which prevents the alliance between the workers and peasants and the leading rôle of the proletariat in the Communist Party and the agrarian revolution, is decisively destroyed once and for all.

In one of the reports of the special Hupeh-Honan-Anhwei committee to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China it is reported that only after the final removal of the mistakes made by the Li Li-san leadership (for example, the division of land among the peasants to an extent sufficient to supply only their own personal requirements, the organisation of competition between the village and district soviets in the work of organising State farms in every village, the fact that no strips of land were extended to the agricultural labourers and coolies, etc.)—only after these mistakes had been finally rectified, was it possible to guarantee a new upsurge of the agrarian and peasant movement. Only on the basis of the correct line in the agrarian revolution was it possible for the Honan Communists to arrive at a position where the "majority of workers and peasants in those districts bordering upon Soviet regions, who had previously belonged to the "Red Spears," "Big Ball," "Lian Juan-Yi" detachments, which fought against the Communists and so on, are now beginning to leave these organisations en masse, and come to the side of the Red Army (from the report to the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, from local party organisations).

It is thus obvious that it is absolutely essential to carry on a relentless struggle against opportunist and semi-Trotskyist mistakes in putting through our agrarian policy. It is absolutely impermissible that every peasant who has a balance of products should be classed a kulak (Honan); it is intolerable that such things should continue as the equitable distribution of lands from above by the method of instructions and orders of the Soviet government, and not by means of developing organisations, the initiative and energy of the peasantry itself. The guiding principle of the party's policy in this sphere of work should be to defend the agricultural workers and the poor peasantry against the kulaks; to bear in mind the interests of the middle peasants as holders of land and also as small private owners. The middle peasant, including the small private owner, should gain something from the agrarian revolution. Without the consent of the small private owner, his lands should on no account be pooled with those of the landlords for equitable distribution. At the same time the Communist Party should fight for the complete liquidation not only

of large and middle-land ownership, but also of small private ownership; should fight in order that the lands be seized from the kulaks, who let them out to peasants; in order that the poor peasants, the agricultural labourers, the coolies and the red army fighters should be the first to be supplied with the best lands. The political influence of the Communist Party should be consolidated organisationally during the agrarian revolution itself, by means of developing Soviet democracy, by livening up the work of the Soviets, by mustering the poor and middle peasantry around the Soviets, by creating groups for the poor peasants attached to the Soviets. It is quite obvious that with the Communist Party and the Soviet Government operating a correct policy, more and more millions of Chinese toilers will join the revolutionary struggle for the land, the influence of the proletariat among the poor and middle peasantry will grow, the link will grow stronger with the poor peasantry. With the operation of a correct line by the Communist Party, the relation of class forces in the process of struggle to bring the bourgeois-democratic agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution to a decisive conclusion will change still further in favour of the proletariat, and this in its turn will create one of the most important essential factors for the transfer of Chinese development on to non-capitalist, i.e., Socialist lines.

Another of the most important and characteristic features of the present revolutionary crisis in China is the fact that the "hegemony of the proletariat is already being consolidated in the beginnings of State power" . . . in the Soviets and the workers' and peasants' Red Army (Resolution of the XI. E.C.C.I. Plenum).

It is well known that the "hegemony of the proletariat is the embryo of, the transitional stage to, the dictatorship of the proletariat." (Stalin.)

The Soviets, which have grown out of the agrarian revolution, represent the power of two classes—the proletariat and the peasantry. The specific feature of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, as it manifests itself in practice in the revolutionary struggle of the masses in China, is that the political vanguard of the Chinese proletariat, its Communist Party, monopolises the revolutionary leadership of the movement of workers and peasants, that it is the only ruling party on the Chinese Soviet territories. The Chinese peasantry has not created its own special party to represent it in the revolution, but has followed the proletariat, has followed its Communist Party. There are many factors which have brought about the unique rôle which the heroic

vanguard of the Chinese proletariat now plays in the Chinese revolutionary movement: the depth of class contradictions in the country, the split between poor and middle peasants on the one hand and the bourgeois elements in China connected with the parasitical capital of the money-lenders and private ownership of the land, on the other hand; the organisational preparedness and independent force represented by the Chinese proletariat (the May 30 movement, Hongkong-Canton strikes, Shanghai and Canton uprisings!); the fact that the proletariat is not far removed from the peasantry and has daily contact with the villages even to-day; the extraordinarily rapid rate with which revolutionary events follow each other; the consciousness of the masses of their radical interests, now that the political régime of the Kuomintang Government is decaying; the unprecedented economic disaster and the distress of the toiling masses; and last, but not least, the existence of the U.S.S.R. and the presence of a universal crisis in the capitalist countries.

To the same extent that the Chinese Communists continually remember the class basis of the existing Soviet power, will the leadership of the Soviets by the Communist Party of China become firmer and stronger. All waverings and hesitations on this question are immediately reflected in the daily concrete policy of the Soviet Government and the Red Army, and are fraught with great dangers and harm to the revolutionary movement. This is why the Communist Party of China fought so stubbornly and firmly against the semi-Trotskyist line of Comrade Li Li-San, which ignored the radical importance of the fact that all revolutionary measures of the Soviets should arise out of the consideration of the dual class nature of the existing government, the fact that untimely Socialist measures are impermissible at the present stage of the movement, and that consideration should be paid at the same time to the fact that systematic, disciplined work to strengthen the leading rôle of the proletariat in this Government is absolutely essential (creation of a regular workers' and peasants' Red Army with a proletarian, Communist, framework of commanding officers; the organisation of Soviets of workers' deputies in the towns on Soviet territories; the systematic advancement of workers to posts in all organs of Soviet dictatorship). It is for this reason also that it is no less dangerous to look upon the Soviets in China as "peasant" Soviets, as it were, or Soviets of toilers, etc. To sink the proletariat into the general mass of toilers, to belittle the rôle of the proletariat in the Chinese revolution obviously contradicts the decision of the XI. E.C.C.I. Plenum, that the

"hegemony of the proletariat in China is already being consolidated in the beginnings of State power."

It is well known that Comrade Lenin, in speaking at the Second Congress of the Comintern of peasant Soviets in colonial countries, was not referring to China or India, but backward countries like Afghanistan, Mongolia and so on. As regards China and India, i.e., those countries where capitalist industry was comparatively well developed and there was already a considerable section of proletarians, successfully fighting for hegemony in the bourgeois-democratic revolutions, the Second Congress of the Communist International raised the question of creating not "peasant," but workers' and peasants' Soviets. The whole experience of revolutionary struggle in China confirms the correctness of this line of the Communist International. The Soviets which exist in China at present (despite the fact that they have not yet spread their power to the industrial centres of the country), can in no way be looked upon as peasant Soviets. This would mean going no farther than the surface of appearances. The Chinese proletariat, through its Communist Party, as far back as in 1927, politically formulated the demands of the peasantry, formulated the programme for the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution, putting forward in particular important radical slogans such as the demand for the confiscation of private-owned lands, the redistribution of lands in the interests of the agricultural workers, poor and middle peasants, and the further nationalisation of the land (when Soviet Power had been consolidated throughout the more decisive territories of China). The proletariat, through its political vanguard and also directly by itself, having sent its finest detachments as military units to the Red Army, and mustered together the scattered partisan detachments of the peasantry, created, and is still creating, its own Communist workers' commanding officers to form the framework of the Red Army, created and strengthened iron, proletarian discipline in the ranks of this Red Army, without which its mighty successes would have been impossible. It is the Chinese proletariat which, through its party, is leading the fighting of the workers' and peasants' Red Army, leading the Soviets and will without doubt have a majority in the central Soviet Government of China. It would be extremely dangerous for the Chinese Communists to be satisfied with this alone and to weaken for one moment their stubborn fight to consolidate the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolution. The spontaneous forces of the agrarian revolution (and they are an enormous revolutionary force which must be

mastered!) have only begun to take on organised political forms, the hegemony of the proletariat is being consolidated only in the beginnings of State Power. Everything must be done to organise the initiative of the workers, to direct this initiative in the direction of building Soviets, perhaps badly and still very weakly, but, nevertheless, invincible Soviets; their initiative must be directed towards leading, organising, consolidating, disciplining, the scattered struggle of the toiling masses, the peasantry, the poor of the towns throughout China, under the leadership of the proletariat and its Communist Party. The spontaneous forces of this gigantic revolutionary movement of hundreds of millions can be organised by the proletariat and is already being organised by it.

With events going forward in this way, how pitiable and weak are the semi-revolutionary, the semi-proletarian (in actual fact bourgeois liberal) representations of counter-revolutionary Trotskyism, to the effect that the Soviet Government must of necessity, is compelled, to build itself up under a double-edged imperialist weapon: by fighting against the imperialists in the larger industrial centres, and only after accomplishing such an extraordinary task, by spreading the movement to the surrounding villages.

Philistine argumentations of this kind merely serve to hide up complete lack of faith in the power of the proletariat to head and lead the peasant movement in agrarian regions; they amount to counter-revolutionary defeatism in regard to the growing Soviet revolution in China. Further, as regards the idea of purely "peasant"

Soviets, or Soviets of Chinese toilers, how they belittle the revolutionary capabilities of the Chinese proletariat as the leader of the revolution! The Leninist line of the Communist International, which was exactly formulated in the theses of the XI. E.C.C.I. Plenum, and stated that the hegemony of the proletariat in China is already being consolidated in the beginnings of the Soviet Government, in the Soviets which have grown out of the agrarian revolution, clearly sees the Chinese Soviets of to-day, and the Chinese Soviets of to-morrow.

The Chinese Soviets of to-day represent the power of two classes, the power of the proletariat and the peasantry; but at the same time a power which was born with the achievement by the proletariat of its hegemony in the Chinese revolution and the leadership in which is carried out by the vanguard of the Chinese proletariat, the Communist Party, as the only ruling party in the revolutionary territories of China. The Chinese Soviets of to-morrow will be those where the Soviets and the Red Army, determinedly carrying out the tasks of the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution to a final conclusion, led by the re-alignment of class forces in favour of the proletariat, mustering the poor peasantry around the proletariat, and at the same time by means of economic and political measures linking up the middle peasantry around the Soviets, will create all the essential, sufficing conditions for the transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the tasks of direct construction of Socialism in China on the basis of the universal support of the world proletariat and the advanced countries of proletarian dictatorship.

SOME QUESTIONS REGARDING THE HISTORY OF BOLSHEVISM

J. STALIN.

*To the Editors of "Proletarskaya Revolyutsia."**
Dear Comrades,

I strongly protest against the publication in "Proletarskaya Revolyutsia" (No. 6, 1930) of Slutski's anti-Party and semi-Trotskyan article, "The Bolsheviks on German Social Democracy in the Period of its Pre-War Crisis," as a discussion article.

Slutski asserts that Lenin (the Bolsheviks) under-estimated the danger of *centralism* in German Social Democracy and in pre-war Social Democracy generally, that is, under-estimated the danger of camouflaged opportunism, the danger of the conciliatory attitude towards opportunism. In other words, according to Slutski, Lenin (the Bolsheviks) did not carry on a relentless struggle against opportunism, for, when all is said and done, the failure to attach due importance to opportunism is renunciation of the struggle against opportunism on a wide front. Thus, it is made to appear that in the period before the war Lenin was not yet a real Bolshevik, that it was only in the period of the Imperialist War, or even at the close of this war, that Lenin became a real Bolshevik. That is what Slutski says in his article. And you, instead of branding this new-found "historian" as a slanderer and falsifier, enter into discussion with him, give him a platform. I cannot refrain from protesting against the publication of Slutski's article in your journal as a discussion article, since the question of Lenin's Bolshevism, the question as to whether Lenin *did or did not carry on* an unrelenting struggle against centralism as a certain form of opportunism, the question as to whether Lenin *was or was not* a real Bolshevik cannot be converted into a subject of discussion.

In your statement sent "in the name of the editors" to the Central Committee on October 20th, you acknowledge that the editors made a mistake in publishing Slutski's article as a discussion article. That is, of course, a good thing, despite the fact that the editor's statement was very belated. But in your statement you commit a fresh mistake when you declare that "the editors consider it to be politically extremely urgent and necessary that the entire complex of problems connected with the mutual relations between the Bolsheviks and the pre-war Second International be further discussed in the pages of "Proletarskaya Revolyutsia." That means that you intend again to draw people into discussion on questions

*"Proletarian Revolution."—Ed.

which represent the axioms of Bolshevism. That signifies that you are again thinking of turning the question of Lenin's Bolshevism from an axiom into a problem needing "further discussion." Why? On what grounds? Everyone knows that Leninism was born, grew up and became strong in the ruthless struggle against opportunism of every brand, including centralism in the West (Kautsky), and centralism in our own country (Trotsky, etc.). This cannot be denied even by the direct enemies of Bolshevism. That is an axiom. But you are attempting to drag us backward, by turning an axiom into a problem requiring "further discussion." Why? On what grounds? Perhaps, through lack of acquaintance with the history of Bolshevism? Perhaps, for the sake of a rotten liberalism, so that the Slutskies and other pupils of Trotsky may not be able to say that they are being gagged. A strange sort of liberalism this, exercised at the expense of the vital interests of Bolshevism.

What is it exactly in Slutski's article that the editors regard as worthy of examination in discussion?

1. Slutski asserts that Lenin (the Bolsheviks) did not pursue a line in the direction of a rupture, of a split with the opportunists of German Social Democracy, with the opportunists of the Second International of the pre-war period. You wish to enter into discussion against this Trotskyan thesis of Slutski's? But what is there to discuss in that? Is it not plain that Slutski is simply slandering Lenin, slandering the Bolsheviks? Slander must be branded, not transformed into a subject for discussion.

Every Bolshevik, if he is truly a Bolshevik, knows that already long before the war, approximately in 1903-04, when the Bolshevik group was first formed in Russia and when the left-wing first made itself felt in German Social Democracy, Lenin took his course for a rupture, for a split with the opportunists here in the Russian Social Democratic Party, and over there, in the Second International, particularly in German Social Democracy. Every Bolshevik knows that it was for that very reason that already at that time (1903-05) the Bolsheviks won for themselves, in the ranks of the opportunists of the Second International, honourable fame as "heretics" and "disruptors." But what could Lenin do, what could the Bolsheviks do if the left Social Democrats in the Second International, and, above all, in Ger-

man Social Democracy, represented a weak and powerless group, which had not yet acquired organisational form, which was ideologically not strongly prepared, which was afraid even to pronounce the word "rupture," "split"? It could not be demanded of Lenin, of the Bolsheviks, that they should from Russia arrange a split in the parties of Western Europe for the benefit of the left-wing. I will not go into the fact that weakness in organisation and ideology was a characteristic feature of the left Social Democrats, and not only in the period before the war. This negative characteristic, as is well known, was preserved among the left-wing even in the period which followed the war. Everyone knows the estimate of the German left Social Democrats, given by Lenin in his famous article, "Junius' Pamphlet,"* written in October, 1916, that is more than two years after the beginning of the war; in it, Lenin, in criticising a whole series of very serious political mistakes committed by the left Social Democrats in Germany, speaks of "*the weakness of the German lefts, who are entangled on all sides in the vile net of Kautskian hypocrisy, pedantry, 'friendship' for the opportunists*"; in it he says that "*Junius has not yet freed herself completely from the 'environment' of the German, even the left-wing Social Democrats, who are afraid of a split, are afraid to carry their revolutionary slogans to their logical conclusion.*"

Of all the groupings in the Second International the Russian Bolsheviks were at that time the only group, which, by its experience in organisation and ideological training, could undertake anything serious in the sense of direct rupture or split with its own opportunists in its own, Russian Social Democracy. If people like Slutski would attempt, not to prove, but simply to pre-suppose that Lenin and the Russian Bolsheviks did not exert all their efforts to organise a split with the opportunists (Plekhanov, Martov, Dan) and to expel the Centralists (Trotsky and other partisans of the August bloc), then one might argue about Lenin's Bolshevism, about the Bolsheviks' Bolshevism. But that is just the point, that people like Slutski do not dare even to hint anything in favour of such a wild pre-supposition. They dare not, for they know that the facts, known to all, of the determined policy of rupture with the opportunists of all brands, which was carried out by the Russian Bolsheviks (1904-12), cry out against such an assumption. They do not dare, for they know that they would be pilloried for it the very next day.

But the question arises: could the Russian Bol-

sheviks bring about a split with their own opportunists and centralists—reconciliators long before the Imperialist War (1904-1912)—without at the same time pursuing a policy of rupture, a policy of a split with the opportunists and centralists of the Second International? Who can doubt that the Russian Bolsheviks regarded their policy towards the opportunists and centralists as a model policy for the left wing in the West? Who can doubt that the Russian Bolsheviks did everything to urge the left-wing Social Democrats in the West, particularly the left wing of German Social Democracy towards a rupture, towards a split with their own opportunists and centralists? It was not the fault of Lenin and the Russian Bolsheviks that the left-wing Social Democrats in the West proved to be too immature to follow in the footsteps of the Russian Bolsheviks.

2. Slutski blames Lenin and the Bolsheviks for not supporting the left wing in German Social Democracy determinedly and irrevocably, for supporting it only with important reservations, for allowing factional considerations to prevent them from giving absolute support to the left wing. You wish to open a discussion against this charlatan and thoroughly false reproach. But what is there in it, properly speaking, that requires discussion? Is it not plain that in this Slutski is manoeuvring and trying, by hurling a false reproach at Lenin and the Bolsheviks to camouflage the real blunders in the position taken up by the left wing in Germany? Is it not plain that the Bolsheviks could *not* support the left wing in Germany, which from time to time wavered between Bolshevism and Menshevism, *without* important reservations, *without* serious criticism of their errors, for to do so would be to betray the working class and its revolution. An impostor's tricks must be branded as such, not turned into a subject for discussion.

Yes, the Bolsheviks supported the left-wing Social Democrats in Germany only with certain important reservations, and criticised their semi-Menshevist errors. But for that they must be praised, not condemned.

Does anybody doubt this?

Let us turn to the best known facts of history:

(a) In 1903 serious disagreements arose between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in Russia on the question of party-membership. By their formula on party-membership the Bolsheviks wished to put an organisational restraint upon the influx of non-proletarian elements into the Party. The danger of such an influx was very real at that time, in view of the bourgeois and democratic character of the Russian revolution. The Russian Mensheviks advocated the opposite position, which opened wide the doors of the Party to non-

*Junius, the *nom de plume* of Rosa Luxemburg, leader of the lefts in the German Social Democratic Party.

proletarian elements. In view of the importance of the questions of the Russian revolution for the world revolutionary movement, the Western European Social Democrats in Germany intervened; Parvus and Rosa Luxemburg, the then leaders of the left wing, also intervened. And what happened? Both came out against the Bolsheviks. At the same time the Bolsheviks were accused of betraying ultra-centralist and Blanquist tendencies. Later, these vulgar and philistine epithets were caught up by the Mensheviks and spread throughout the world.

(b) In 1905 disagreements developed between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks in Russia as to the character of the Russian revolution. The Bolsheviks advocated an alliance between the working class and the peasantry under the hegemony of the proletariat. The Bolsheviks asserted that we must bring about the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry in order to pass immediately from the bourgeois democratic revolution to the socialist revolution and in this to secure the support of the rural poor. The Mensheviks in Russia rejected the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois democratic revolution; as against the policy of alliance between the working class and the peasantry they gave preference to the policy of compromise with the liberal bourgeoisie; they declared that the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the working class and peasantry was a reactionary Blanquist scheme which ran contrary to the development of the bourgeois revolution. What was the attitude of the left-wing in the German Social Democracy, of Parvus and Rosa Luxemburg, in this controversy? They invented a Utopian and semi-Menshevist scheme of permanent revolution (a monstrous distortion of the Marxian scheme of revolution), which was completely permeated with the Menshevist refutation of the policy of alliance between the working class and peasantry, and opposed this scheme to the Bolshevik scheme of the revolutionary and democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. Later, this semi-Menshevist scheme of permanent revolution was picked up by Trotsky (in part by Martov) and turned into a weapon of struggle against Leninism.

(c) One of the most urgent questions that confronted the parties of the Second International in the period before the war was the national and colonial question, the question of the oppressed nationalities and colonies, the question of liberating the oppressed nationalities and colonies, the question of the paths of the struggle against imperialism, the question of the overthrow of imperialism. For the sake of developing the proletarian revolution and encircling imperialism,

the Bolsheviks proposed a policy of supporting the liberation movement among the oppressed nationalities and colonies on the basis of the self-determination of nations, and developed the plan for a united front between the proletarian revolution in the progressive countries and the revolutionary liberation movement of the peoples of the colonies and oppressed countries. The opportunists of all countries, the social-chauvinists and social-imperialists of all countries hastened to rally against this scheme and against the Bolsheviks. They slandered the Bolsheviks, calling them mad dogs. What position did the left-wing Social Democrats in the West take up at that time? They developed a semi-Menshevist theory of imperialism, rejected the principle of the self-determination of nations in its Marxist sense (including separation and formation of independent states), resisted the thesis of the important revolutionary significance of the liberation movement of the colonies and oppressed countries, rejected the thesis of the possibility of a united front between the proletarian movement and the movement for national emancipation and opposed all this semi-Menshevist hodge-podge, representing an out-and-out under-estimation of the national and colonial question, to the Marxist scheme of the Bolsheviks. It is well known that this semi-Menshevist hodge-podge was later caught up by Trotsky and used by him as a weapon of struggle against Leninism.

Such were the errors, known to everyone, of the left-wing Social Democrats in Germany.

I shall not speak of the other mistakes of the German left wing which were criticised in various articles by Lenin.

Nor shall I speak of the mistakes committed by them in appraising the policy of the Bolsheviks in the period of the October Revolution.

What do these mistakes of the German left wing, taken from the history of the pre-war period show, if not that the left-wing Social Democrats, despite their left character, had not yet thrown off their Menshevist baggage?

Of course, the left wing in Germany have something else besides serious mistakes to record. They also have great and important revolutionary acts to their credit. I have in mind a whole series of services and revolutionary acts in connection with questions of internal policy and, in particular, of electoral struggle, on the questions of parliamentary and non-parliamentary struggle, on the general strike, on war, on the revolution of 1905 in Russia, etc. That was precisely why the Bolsheviks regarded them as a left wing, supported and urged them forward. But this does not and cannot remove the fact that the left-wing Social Democrats in Germany did commit a whole

series of very serious political and theoretical errors, that they had not yet thrown off their Menshevik burden and therefore needed very serious criticism on the part of the Bolsheviks.

Judge for yourselves now whether Lenin and the Bolsheviks could have supported the left-wing Social Democrats in the West *without serious reservations, without serious criticism of their mistakes*, and not betray the interests of the revolution, betraying communism.

Is it not clear that Slutski, in reproaching Lenin and the Bolsheviks for that for which he should have applauded them if he were a Bolshevik, exposes himself utterly as a semi-Menshevik, as a masked Trotskyist?

Slutski assumes that in their estimate of the left wing in the West, Lenin and the Bolsheviks took as their point of departure their own factional considerations, that, consequently, the Russian Bolsheviks sacrificed the great cause of the international revolution to their own factional interests. It is scarcely necessary to prove that there can be nothing more vulgar and vile than such an assumption. There can be nothing more vulgar, for even the frantic Philistines among the Mensheviks are beginning to understand that the Russian revolution is not a private matter of Russians, that it is, on the contrary, the cause of the working class of all the world, the cause of the world proletarian revolution. There can be nothing more vile, for even the professional slanderers in the Second International are beginning to understand that the logical and thoroughly revolutionary internationalism of the Bolsheviks is the model of proletarian internationalism for the workers of all countries.

Yes, the Russian Bolsheviks did bring to the forefront the fundamental problems of the Russian revolution, such as the question of the Party, of the attitude of Marxists to the bourgeois democratic revolution, of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry, of the hegemony of the proletariat, of the struggle inside and outside of parliament, of the general strike, of the bourgeois democratic revolution growing into the socialist revolution, of the dictatorship of the proletariat, of imperialism, of the self-determination of nations, of the liberation movement of oppressed nationalities and colonies, of rendering political support to this movement, etc. They advanced these problems as the touchstone on which they tested the revolutionary stamina of the left-wing Social Democrats in the West. Did they have the right to do so? Yes, they did. They not only had the right; it was their duty to do so. It was their duty to do so because all these questions were at the same time fundamental questions of the world revolution, to the tasks of

which the Bolsheviks subordinated all their policy, all their tactics. It was their duty to do so, because only on such questions could they really test the revolutionary character of the various groups in the Second International. The question arises: what has the "factionalism" of the Russian Bolsheviks, and "factional" considerations got to do with this?

As early as 1902 Lenin wrote in his pamphlet, "What is to be Done?" that "*History has confronted us with an immediate task, which is the most revolutionary of all the immediate tasks of the proletariat of any country whatsoever*," that "*the fulfilment of this task, the destruction of the most powerful bulwark not only of European, but of Asiatic, reaction would make the Russian proletariat the vanguard of the international revolutionary proletariat*." Thirty years have passed since the pamphlet, "What is to be Done?" appeared. No one will dare deny that the events of this period have brilliantly confirmed Lenin's words. But does it not follow from this that the Russian revolution was (and has remained) the key position of the world revolution, that the fundamental questions of the Russian revolution were at the same time (and now are) the fundamental questions of the world revolution?

Is it not plain that only on these fundamental questions was it possible to put the left-wing Social Democrats of the West to a real test?

Is it not plain that those who regard these questions as "factional" questions thereby expose themselves to the full as Philistines and degenerates?

3. Slutski asserts that so far a sufficient quantity of official documents has not been found to prove Lenin's (the Bolsheviks') determined and relentless struggle against centralism. He employs that bureaucratic thesis as an irrefutable argument in favour of the postulate that Lenin (the Bolsheviks), under-estimated the danger of centralism in the Second International. And you set about arguing against this nonsense, against this rascally hair-splitting. But what is there, properly speaking, to argue about? Is it not plain, without arguing, that by his talk about documents Slutski is trying to cover up the wretchedness and falsity of his, so-called, position?

Slutski regards the party documents now available as insufficient. Why? On what grounds? Are the documents, known to everyone, regarding the Second International, as well as the internal party struggle in Russian Social Democracy not sufficient to plainly demonstrate the revolutionary irreconcilability of Lenin and the Bolsheviks in their struggle against the opportunists and the centralists? Is Slutski at all acquainted with

these documents? What other documents does he need?

Let us suppose that in addition to the documents already known a mass of other documents will be found, in the shape, for example, of resolutions of the Bolsheviks again urging the necessity for wiping out centralism. Does that mean that the mere presence of paper documents is sufficient to demonstrate the real revolutionary character and real relentlessness of the Bolsheviks towards centralism? Who, besides archive rats, can rely on paper documents alone? Who, besides archive rats, does not understand that the party and its leaders must be tested first of all by their *deeds* and not only by their declarations? History knows not a few socialists who readily signed any revolutionary resolution in order to escape their annoying critics. But that does not mean that they carried these resolutions into effect. History knows further not a few socialists who, foaming at the mouth, called upon the workers' parties of *other countries* to perform the most revolutionary actions imaginable. But that does not mean that they did not in their own party, or in their own country, *shrink* from fighting their *own* opportunists, their *own* bourgeoisie. Is not that why Lenin taught us to test revolutionary parties, tendencies and leaders, not by their declarations and resolutions, but by their *deeds*?

Is it not plain that if Slutski really wished to test the irreconcilability of Lenin's and the Bolsheviks' attitude toward centralism, he should have taken as the *foundation* of his article, not separate documents and two or three personal letters, but their *deeds*, their *history*, their *acts*? Did we not have opportunists, centralists in our Russian Social Democracy? Did not the Bolsheviks wage a determined and relentless struggle against all these tendencies? Were not these tendencies bound up in ideas and organisation with the opportunists and centralists in the West? Did not the Bolsheviks rout the opportunists and centralists as no other left-wing group routed them anywhere else in the world? After all that, how can anyone say that Lenin and the Bolsheviks under-estimated the danger of centralism? Why did Slutski ignore these facts which have decisive significance in characterising the Bolsheviks? Why did he not make use of the more reliable method of Lenin and the Bolsheviks and test them by their deeds, by their acts? Why did he prefer the less reliable method of rummaging among casually collected papers?

Because the more reliable method of testing the Bolsheviks by their deeds would have upset Slutski's whole position in a flash.

Because the test of the Bolsheviks by their deeds would have shown that the Bolsheviks are

the *only* revolutionary organisation in the world which has utterly destroyed its opportunists and centralists and driven them out of its party.

Because the real deeds and the real history of the Bolsheviks would have shown that Slutski's teachers, the Trotskyites, were the principal and fundamental group which planted centralism in Russia and for this purpose created a special organisation as the hotbed of centralism, viz., the August bloc.

Because the testing of the Bolsheviks by their deeds would have exposed Slutski once and for all as a falsifier of the history of our party, who is trying to cover up the centralism of pre-war Trotskyism by the slanderous accusation against Lenin and the Bolsheviks of under-estimating the danger of centralism.

That, comrades editors, is how matters stand with Slutski and his article.

You see, the editors made a mistake in opening a discussion with a falsifier of the history of our party.

What caused the editors to take this wrong road? I think that they were impelled on that road by decadent liberalism, which has spread to a certain extent among one section of the Bolsheviks. Some Bolsheviks think that Trotskyism is a faction of communism, which has made mistakes, it is true, which has done many foolish things, which has sometimes even been anti-soviet, but which is, nevertheless, a faction of communism. Hence, a certain liberalism in dealing with Trotskyites and people who think like Trotsky. It is scarcely necessary to prove that such a view of Trotskyism is profoundly wrong and pernicious. As a matter of fact, Trotskyism has long since ceased to be a faction of communism. As a matter of fact, Trotskyism is the vanguard of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, which is carrying on the struggle against the communists, against the Soviet Government, against the building of socialism in the U.S.S.R.

Who gave the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie its intellectual weapon against Bolshevism, in the form of the thesis of the impossibility of building socialism in our country, in the form of the thesis of the inevitability of the degeneration of the Bolsheviks, etc.? That weapon was given it by Trotskyism? The fact that all anti-soviet groups in the U.S.S.R. in their attempts to give grounds for their arguments for the inevitability of the struggle against the Soviet Government referred to the well-known thesis of Trotskyism of the impossibility of building socialism in our country, of the inevitable degeneration of the Soviet government, of the probability of the return to capitalism, cannot be regarded as an accident.

Who gave the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie in the U.S.S.R. its tactical weapon in the form of attempts at open attacks on the Soviet Government? This weapon was given to it by the Trotskyites, who tried to organise anti-soviet demonstrations in Moscow and Leningrad on November 7th, 1927. It is a fact that the anti-soviet actions of the Trotskyites raised the spirits of the bourgeoisie and let loose the work of counter-revolutionary sabotage of the bourgeois specialists.

Who gave the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie an organisational weapon in the form of attempts at organising underground anti-soviet organisations? This weapon was given to it by the Trotskyites who founded their own anti-Bolshevik illegal group. It is a fact that the underground anti-soviet work of the Trotskyites facilitated the organised formation of the anti-soviet group within the U.S.S.R.

Trotskyism is the vanguard of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

That is why liberalism towards Trotskyism, even if it is shattered and concealed, is stupidly bordering on crime, bordering on treason to the working class.

That is why the attempts of certain "litterateurs" and "historians" to smuggle the disguised Trotskyite rubbish into our literature must encounter determined resistance from the Bolsheviks.

That is why we cannot admit a literary discussion with these Trotskyite smugglers.

It seems to me that the "historians" and "litterateurs" of the category of the Trotskyite smugglers are for the present trying to carry on their work of smuggling along two lines.

First of all, they are trying to prove that *Lenin* in the period before the war under-estimated the danger of centralism, while leaving the inexperienced reader to surmise that *Lenin* was not at that time a real revolutionary, but became one only after the war, after he had been "re-equipped" with Trotsky's help. Slutski may be regarded as a typical representative of such a type of smuggler. We have seen above that Slutski and Co. are not worth our spending a great deal of attention on.

Secondly, they try to prove that *Lenin* did not understand the necessity for the development of the bourgeois democratic revolution into the socialist revolution, while leaving the experi-

enced reader to surmise that *Lenin* was not at that time a real Bolshevik, that he grasped the necessity for such a development only after the war, after he had been "re-equipped" with Trotsky's help. We may regard Volosevich, author of "Course of History of the C.P.S.U.," as a typical representative of such a sort of smuggler. It is true, *Lenin* already in 1905 wrote that "*from the democratic revolution we shall immediately begin to pass over, and that in proportion to our strength, to the strength of the conscious and organised proletariat, we shall begin to pass over to the socialist revolution,*" that "*we stand for uninterrupted revolution, we will not halt half-way.*" It is true, a great number of facts and documents of an analogous sort could be found in the works of *Lenin*, but what concern have people like Volosevich with the facts and the life and activity of *Lenin*? People like Volosevich write in order, by camouflaging themselves in Bolshevik colours, to drag in their anti-Leninist contraband and to lie against the Bolsheviks and falsify the history of the Bolshevik Party.

You see, the Voloseviches are worthy of the Slutskies.

Such are the "paths and crossroads" of the Trotskyite smugglers.

You yourselves understand that it is not the business of the editors to facilitate the smuggling activity of such "historians" by granting them the platform for discussion.

The task of the editors is, in my opinion, to raise the questions concerning the history of Bolshevism to the proper level, to put the study of the history of our Party on scientific, Bolshevik paths and concentrate attention against the Trotskyite and all other falsifiers of the history of our Party, by systematically tearing the mask from them.

This is the more necessary since even several of our historians—I speak of historians without quotation marks—the *Bolshevik* historians of our Party—are not free of mistakes which bring grist to the mill of people like Slutski and Volosevich. In this respect, even Comrade Yaroslavsky does not, unfortunately, represent an exception; his books on the history of the C.P.S.U., despite all their merits, contain a number of errors of principle and history.

With comradely greetings,

J. STALIN.

THE FRESH WAVE OF WHITE TERROR IN BULGARIA

P. ISKROV.

COMRADE KOFARJIEV (Sasho) has been murdered by the hangmen of the Bulgarian proletariat.

A severe loss has been inflicted on the Communist International, on the Bulgarian Communist Party and on the proletariat of Bulgaria. The secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party, comrade Nikola Kofarjiev has been sniped down by his murderers in a street of Sofia. Judging by the police information, on learning that Kofarjiev was in Bulgaria, the police organised the pursuit. For three nights the police ambuscade lay in wait for Nikola Kofarjiev. On October 30th it carried through its plan. While crossing the street, Nikola Kofarjiev and a comrade were caught in the ring of this ambuscade and in the exchange of shots which broke out comrade Kofarjiev fell dead, revolver in hand, while his comrade was wounded and arrested. According to the police information, this is Racho Ponev, a textile worker from Slivna, and a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

This foul murder of comrade Kofarjiev is accompanied by an unchecked fascist terror exercised against the revolutionary working-class movement and its vanguard, the Communist Party, such as has not been seen since the time of the darkest reaction which followed the *coup d'état* of June 9th, 1923. The new Government of fascist dictatorship, the "democratic and agrarian" Government, has greatly intensified the persecution of the revolutionary proletariat and of the Communist movement. The last four months alone provided a whole series of new victims of this reign of terror; the authorities fired on strikers in Yambol, Danoilov and Stoyanov (July 22nd), on poor peasants in Peterchov, Stoyanov; Dyanov, in the villages of Dolbaki and Kran, on the occasion of the International Youth Day (September 6th), in Chelakov. In October, on one of the streets of Sofia, the police wounded severely and arrested the young worker, Pelo Ivanov Pelovski. At the police station he was subjected to torture to secure evidence.

The Government of the "democrat" Moshanov and the agrarian Gichev, makes a practice of mass arrests, of animal-like brutalities and cruel tortures inflicted on the leaders of the working-class movement and of Communism. Right now, as these very lines are being written, in the torture-chambers of the Bulgarian police, hundreds of arrested workers and working women are being subjected to tortures and sufferings such as bring to life again the black pages of the bourgeois dictatorship of the first half of 1925. A few days after the murder of Kofarjiev, the tobacco worker, Christ Kochev, and the student Pacho Nenov were tortured to death in the police headquarters. The former was accused by the police of

being treasurer, the latter of being the manager of the technical section of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party. At that same time Racho Tsonev and the proletarian poet Hrito Radevski were carried away half-dead from the police headquarters, no one knows whither. It is not known whether they are still alive or not. Even according to the information of the bourgeois Press, during the last few days more than 120 persons have been arrested in Sofia, including thirty women. Mass arrests are going on in Plovdiv, T. Pazardjie, Slivna and other cities. The deputies belonging to the Workers' Party who speak at the meetings of workers and peasants, are subjected to manhandling by the police and especially by organised fascist bands. Through the mouth of the Minister of Justice the Government declares in the Press that it is preparing for the suppression of the legal Workers' Party, as it is merely another form "of the Communist Party." At the same time, sensational reports are being circulated about the seizure of the "archives of the Communist Party." The corrupt papers, in touch with the police, publish "figures" giving the budget of the Communist Party, in which there is supposed to be an item of revenue from "dues paid by the deputies of the workers' parliamentary group." In the Press the most vile misrepresentations of the political line adopted by the Communist Party and the Communist International are resorted to in order to give the idea that the Communist Party in Bulgaria is engaged in the direct preparation for an armed insurrection. In order to lend plausibility to this rumour in the eyes of politically unconscious strata of the toiling masses, the traditional lie has been let loose, about an "instruction for organising an armed insurrection" discovered in the "archive" of the Communist Party (and in the documents found on Nikola Kofarjiev). In a word, the Moshanov-Gichev Government, following the example of Lyapchev and Tsankov, do not despise any means, even absurd fabrications, in order to prepare "public opinion" amongst all the bourgeois and the foreign capitalist Governments in favour of the fresh wave of violence against the working-class and Communist movements in Bulgaria.

* * *

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria has appealed to the masses, protesting against the murder of the secretary of the Party, comrade Nikola Kofarjiev, and against the new raids made on the workers' quarters, arrests, tortures and murders ("suicides," as the police call them) at police headquarters. At the same time, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria has appealed to the German, French, Czechoslovak,

Dutch and Swiss Communist Parties ; in its appeal it points to the fact that the Government is getting ready to prohibit all legal revolutionary organisations of the workers, especially the Workers' Party and the independent trade unions. It asks their parliamentary and extra-parliamentary support in the struggle which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria is waging against the murders, the reign of terror and the break-up of the workers' organisations in Bulgaria.

From all parts of the country there come protests made at meetings of workers and peasants against the murder of the leader of the Communist Party, comrade Kofarjiev. The rising wave of the workers' movement is shown by a whole series of facts, during the last few days. For example, in Eski Jumai (Northern Bulgaria) an election meeting was held just recently. The police attacked the people at the meeting, but the workers not only did not retreat in the face of armed force, but even organised mass resistance, defended themselves with stones, sticks, etc., and even brought into operation the fire-hoses which they had seized. In Pazarjik similar events took place (Southern Bulgaria), the people taking part in a protest meeting against the beating up of the worker deputy Konstantin Rusinov, by the Government agents. They acted in the same manner. The workers succeeded in beating off the attack of the police and bringing the meeting to a close.

* * *

The clashes with the police and the troops in many cities and villages, the revolutionary character of the meetings and demonstrations with active participation and stubborn self-defence by the masses, even though self-defence has not yet been given an organisational form, the united front of the toiling peasants with the striking workers, the collection and transfer of supplies by the peasants for the strikers in a number of cities,—all these are facts which show that the masses are passing over ever more determinedly to the counter-offensive against the fascist reign of terror of the new "democratic-agrarian" Government, which has already bespattered itself with the workers' blood. In the ranks of the Agrarian Union, which along with Social-Democracy, is the main support for the dictatorship of the police and Fascists, a process of ferment has begun. A series of village organisations of the Union have openly expressed their disappointment at the participation of the Agrarian Union in the Government of bourgeois dictatorship, have abandoned its ranks and gone over to the legal Workers' Party.

The fresh offensive of the Government and the employers upon the standard of living of the masses of workers and peasants is with even greater force intensifying the class battles in Bulgaria. The Government is bringing into effect a fresh reduction in the wages of civil servants. At the same time in the

factories a most unheard-of act is being carried out : the wages of the workers are being cut by 20 to 30 per cent. Now the Government is attacking even the miserable doles given to a small number of the unemployed. With winter approaching a large number of tobacco warehouses and other businesses are being closed and the numbers of unemployed are growing. Everywhere in the villages, the domestic chattels of the poor and middle peasants are being auctioned off for failure to pay taxes and debts. Moshanov and Gishev are preparing a law to levy fresh taxes on the articles of mass consumption. The Government has raised the price of bread by 30 per cent., other products of prime necessity have also risen in price. Under the mask of "stabilising prices" and "restricting cartels" a new campaign of robbery is being organised, to cover the deficit in the Government's budget. All this leads to the strengthening of the revolutionary movement. The masses of workers and peasants are more and more determinedly acting under the slogans of the Communist Party. On November 1st, during the Fascist raids and pogroms, the municipal elections took place in 900 villages and 19 cities ; the outcome clearly shows the new impetus imparted to the class struggle since the change in the Government, in June of this year. In these elections the revolutionary bloc of workers and peasants took second place after the Government, while in the parliamentary elections of June 21st, of this year, it was *third*. The Social-Democratic Party was again left dangling at the tail of the weakest groups of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie. According to the official figures, the Government received 256,898 votes, the Workers' Party 50,753 (in reality, about 55,000). The Democratic Alliance 31,594, the Social-Fascists 5,165, etc. In a number of villages the municipal councils fell into the hands of the revolutionary peasantry. In the cities, the revolutionary workers, and the mass of the poor, which follows them, were also successful at the polls. In Bratza, which in the past has been a stronghold of Social-Fascism, and from which the Social-Fascist leader, Pastukhov, has invariably been returned to Parliament (of course, with the help of the police), the list of the Workers' Party received 758 votes to 182 cast for the Social-Democratic Party. In Eski-Jumai, after a street battle by the workers against the police, the Workers' Party list received 628 votes (89 for the Social-Fascists and Artisans), in Berkovitz 307 (10 for the Social-Fascists), in Palatiurishtha 474 (176 for the Social-Fascists), in Peshtera 409 (152 for the Social-Fascists), in Pirdo 204 (34 for the Social-Fascists), etc.

Another fact which fully indicates the revolutionary feeling of the masses is the *mass election of a worker and peasant delegation to the U.S.S.R.* The Government has forbidden the first worker delegate to the U.S.S.R., the deputy Petko

Napetev, to make public reports on his visit to the U.S.S.R. At mass meetings the workers and toiling peasants have already chosen 2,000 worker and peasant delegates to be sent to the U.S.S.R. Of course, the workers realise that such a huge delegation cannot be sent, but they want in this way to show in fact, their readiness to fight by every means, both to defend the U.S.S.R. and to attack the Fascist dictatorship of Bulgaria, under its new "democratic-agrarian" label.

All the activity of the murdered secretary of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, comrade Kofarjiev (Sasho), was closely bound up with this fresh wave of revolutionary advance and within this wave, towards strengthening the organising and guiding rôle of the Communist Party.

After passing through the dark school of apprenticeship in one of the barber's shops of Sofia, Nikola Kofarjiev became a Young Communist at the age of 15 or 16 years. At 17 he made application to enter the Communist Party. As a minor he could not receive a Party card, but he was permitted to attend the Party meetings and to take an active part in the work of the Party. Thus, while still a youngster, he became an active party-worker. He himself used to relate that he had been urged on to the path of revolutionary enthusiasm by the October Revolution and the victory of the Red Army over the imperialist interventionists and the White Guard generals. A true son of his Leninist era, the era of the proletarian revolution, he entered the movement at the crest of the revolutionary wave in Bulgaria, which followed the imperialist war of 1914-1918. The political awakening of Nikola Kofarjiev coincided with the awakening of his Communist consciousness.

The *September insurrection* of 1923 gives Kofarjiev his revolutionary christening. The height of his revolutionary activity, as worker and leader in the Young Communist League and in the Party, is indissolubly linked up with the September insurrection. He took part in preparing it and carrying it through. He organised the armed struggle of the 8,000 miners of Pernik. In the September insurrection he came to the fore as the leader of the Young Communists,—first, in its largest organisation, in Sofia, and later of the entire Young Communist League. Kofarjiev shattered the opportunists and liquidators, the followers of Devitiyunev and the enemies of the September insurrection within the Party. When the right-opportunist wing revolted against the revolutionary insurrection and its leader, the Communist Party, Kofarjiev proved to be one of those Young Communists and young party workers who fought most energetically for the position of the Communist International and the Party on June 9th, and saw the triumph and correctness of this position in the slogan for the general insurrection of September 22nd and 23rd. But for the Party the September uprising was not merely an historic act of the

masses, it was a *policy, a line, a programme, the only perspective* for the proletariat to set itself free from capitalism. It is just this which comrade Kofarjiev grasped in September, 1923, and this was characteristic of that Kofarjiev, our *Sasho*, who perished on October 30th so prematurely and tragically by the bullet of the hangmen of the September insurrection.

The revolutionary underground work was the practical and theoretical school of Marxism-Leninism for Sasho. In the revolutionary underground work he became the leader of the Young Communists, later of the Party. His talent, his natural capacities, his supreme devotion to the proletarian revolution, to the Communist International and the Young Communist International came to full bloom under conditions of underground work. There he showed himself to be a remarkably talented mass-leader; he always went in the vanguard of the struggle against the liquidators and renegades of the underground Party, and was a pioneer of the struggle and practical work in building up the legal mass organisations of the proletariat and its younger generation.

Anti-militarist work is the sphere in which comrade Kofarjiev displayed a particularly fine sense, daring and devotion, as early as the first period following the defeat of the insurrection of 1923. He and the comrades who were working with him in creating soldiers' organisations, even in 1923-1925 gave the first practical experiences of the Party's leadership of the struggle against militarism in Bulgaria. He was one of the first comrades to grasp, before the rest, after the defeat of the 1923 insurrection, that the Communists must strive to disintegrate the armed forces of the bourgeoisie, for that was one of the chief conditions needed for the victory of the revolution. In the history of the Young Communists and of the Communist Party in Bulgaria the name of comrade Kofarjiev will remain a symbol of the revolutionary education of new cadres in anti-militarist work.

A revolutionary, a Bolshevik, capable of seizing upon and independently elaborating any militant problem of the Bulgarian or international Communist Movement, comrade Kofarjiev, while still secretary of the Young Communists, was advanced to leading positions in the Party. The Party elected him a member of the Central Committee and at the same time at the Congress of the Young Communist International he was elected a member of its Presidium and Executive Committee. In 1926-1927, at his post as secretary of the Young Communist League, comrade Kofarjiev fought to correct the right-wing, opportunist errors (unification of the proletarian class organisation of youth, with the Socialist Union of Youth, a wrong attitude towards the guiding rôle of the Young Communist International in the World Movement of the Young Communists), which had been made by the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Young Communist League. Under comrade Kofarjiev's leadership, the

errors were corrected. In 1930-1931, now as secretary of the Communist Party, Kofarjiev was struggling to carry into effect the August resolution (1930), passed by the Political Secretariat of the Executive Committee of the Communist International regarding the position and tasks of the Communist Party of Bulgaria. With his return a fresh current was to be felt in dealing with Party questions. A detailed inspection of each Party organisation, beginning with the most important industrial centres, the study of the conditions of work peculiar to each organisation,—this is what comrade Kofarjiev succeeded in organising. Under his leadership began the practical progress of the Communist Party of Bulgaria towards Bolshevisation as had been indicated to it by the Communist International in its resolutions on the Bulgarian question. Kofarjiev was a genuine pioneer of the general line of the Communist International in Bulgaria, and in the history of our Party his name will remain forever bound up with the most decisive moment of the turning of the Party, under the leadership of the Communist International and based on the lessons of the September insurrection

towards its reorganisation into a genuinely Bolshevik Party.

Of late Kofarjiev had raised in the most resolute manner the question of self-criticism as the fundamental method for the work of the cells and Party organisations; on the basis of his own experience he pointed out (by the way, he was taking part personally in the conference of several of the provincial organisations at the very time the police were searching for him) the concrete links which every organisation must lay hold of at the present moment.

Comrade Nikola Kofarjiev remains a bright name in the history of the Bulgarian and International Communist Movement. The cause of comrade Kofarjiev will be carried forward by tens and hundreds of thousands of workers and toiling peasants in Bulgaria. Kofarjiev the Bolshevik, was born from a drop of the same blood as Karl Liebknecht. From the blood of the Bolshevik comrade Kofarjiev will be born new proletarian, Bolshevik cadres, and they will carry on to its final victory, after the example of the October Revolution, the struggle which Nikola Kofarjiev carried on and for which he died.

CORRECTIONS TO "THE COMMON FATE OF CAPITALISM AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY"

AS a result of a gross error on the part of the technical apparatus the uncorrected copy of the article of *Bela Kun*, "The Common Fate of Capitalism and the Social-Democracy" was published in No. 17. We therefore publish corrections thereto in this issue as follow:—

On page 482, paragraph 4, line 4: Instead of "play a decisive part" read "will play a most active part."

Further, same line: Delete "for it does not want to lose its influence to Fascism inside the bourgeois camp."

Same page, 4 lines from bottom: Instead of "in capitalist countries on the other" read "in capitalist countries and the growth and sharpening in the camp of the imperialists on the other."

Same page, column 2, first paragraph beginning "The mutual hostility . . ." etc., to delete and substitute "Communism and capitalism clash with extreme sharpness but not only on an international scale but also on a national one in most capitalist countries. On the basis of the growing revolutionary upsurge the influence of most Communist Parties grows. The International Social-Democracy must strain all its forces to seek to defend the interests of its social groups, the labour aristocracy and a few sections of the petty bourgeoisie which it politically represents and whose fate is indivisibly connected with that of capitalism itself. Therefore its bitter struggle against the Communist Parties, but also its most active participation in the 'fascisation' of the entire State system."

Same page, column 2, second paragraph, beginning: "Here found expression" . . . ending "while the revolution is maturing" to be deleted.

Same page, column 2, third paragraph, fifth line, last sentence: "And this precisely was the keynote of the Vienna deliberations as to the cure and salvation of capitalism" to delete.

Same page, column 2, last sentence, beginning: "Three main directions . . ." down to "against the proletarian revolution" to delete. Substitute "Three chief ways of saving capitalism, the struggle for a capitalist solution can be detected in the resolutions and debates of the Vienna Congress:—

- (1) Energetic participation in all measures which seek the overcoming of the crisis with capitalist methods.
- (2) The struggle for the concealing and temporary forcing back of the inner imperialistic contradictions in the interests of the preparation of the anti-Soviet war.
- (3) The greatest possible 'fascisation' of the State apparatus under the cover of screaming of the salvation of 'democracy' and the chatter about 'socialism.'"

Page, 483, first paragraph: Instead of "These three lines of attack" read "These three ways," etc.

Same page, column 2, first paragraph, seventh line: Instead of "being reduced" read "being abolished."

Page 484, first paragraph: Instead of "endangered German capital" read "German capitalism which is most endangered by the Revolution."

Same page, first paragraph: From "the country over which MacDonald rules . . ." to "Central European scale" delete. Substitute "in England the finance crisis also threatens."

Same page, column 2, second paragraph: Delete from "It followed therefore, that . . . etc." and add "The tactic of the small daily questions and the struggle for the satisfaction of a few partial demands of the working-class, (in this and this only) consisted the whole struggle of Social-Democracy against capitalism, has to-day developed into the plundering of the working-class. What else are such

'partial demands' as the 40-hour week without the same wages, the abolition of benefits, etc. ? Precisely because of this it followed . . ." etc.

Page 486, second column, first paragraph, seventh line : Instead of "the race against Fascism" read "their co-operation and competition with Fascism."

Same page, second column : Instead of "the words of Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg" to "rejecting this inheritance" read "as to recommend the Social-Fascist Congress to answer the declaration of war with the overthrow of capitalism, a demand included in the decisions of the Second International, the leaders of the post-war Second International have shown not the least vacillation in the rejection of this inheritance."

Page 487, column 2, line 1 : Delete "of first importance."

Same page, column 2, paragraph 5 : "systematic deafening by pacifism." "pacifism" in inverted commas.

Page 488, paragraph 4 : Instead of "Socialism in the event of" read "Socialism (which neither the bourgeoisie nor the Social-Democracy take seriously) in the event of" etc.

Page 489, paragraph 1 for "which had nothing to do with socialism, read "which frequently had nothing to do with socialism."

Same page, same paragraph, line 10 : For "There were various forms of bourgeois and feudal socialism" read "There have been many forms of socialism, including a bourgeois and a feudal."

Same page, same column, three lines from bottom : "effectiveness" in quotes.

Same page, column 2, line 5 : Instead of "it points in anguish to the radicalisation of the masses" read "the radicalisation of the masses arouses in them greater anxiety than in the case of the leading wing of the Party and T.U. bureaucracy."

Same page, same paragraph, line 9 : "more socialist democratic" in quotes.

Same page, column 2, paragraph 5 : Instead of "mass basis" read "mass influence."

Same page, column 2, eight lines from bottom : Instead of "Fascist danger" read "Fascism."

Same page, last sentence : Beginning "The left wing manoeuvre . . ." to "in common" to delete.

Page 490, column 1, paragraph 3, last line : Instead of "but also attempted to force those services by all the rules of the art of blackmail" read "repeatedly offered."

Same page, column 1, paragraph 2 from bottom : Instead of "Notwithstanding the phrases" read "Under the cover of the phrases."

Same page, column 1 : Delete last paragraph "Tarnow's slander," and substitute "Tarnow declared at the Leipzig Party Congress that 'the entire story of the development of the working class' . . . is actually nothing more than a process of lending support to the capitalist economy."

"This is nothing but a despicable greasy slander of the working-class movement before and after the war. The

history of the Second International immediately before, during and after the war, was, it is true, actually nothing more than a process of lending support to the capitalist economy."

Page 491, line 17 : Instead of "effective lever" read "decisive lever".

Page 491, line 18 : After "overturn Social-Democratic influence" insert "through Communist mass work in the factories."

Same page, line 23 : Instead "put itself (at the head of) the daily struggle for small demands" read "put itself at the head of the daily struggle of the masses for small demands and still more frequently sabotaged."

Same page, paragraph 2, line 1 : Instead of "Just for this reason a blow must be given Social-Democracy in this field" read "Just for this reason in this stage of the crisis, naturally *not* otherwise than through the connecting up of these partial demands with the ultimate objective, with the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism a blow must be given Social-Democracy in this field."

Same page, column 2, top : After "Social-Democracy" add "and is a link in the entire chain of the struggle, the preparatory stage to higher forms of struggle."

Same page, column 2, line 11 : Add after "at the expense of the working-class" "as the starting point for the mobilisation of the masses for the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism" . . . etc.

Same page, column 2, paragraph 2, line 8 : Instead of "even though the word socialism was misused" read "in order to cover up the plundering and oppression of the toilers and exploited with this chatter."

Page 492, column 1, line 9 : Instead of "the wave of pacifism which issuing from the Vienna Congress has flooded the world of the workers" read "the attempts of the Social-Democracy to create the united front of the imperialists against the Soviet Union."

Same page, column 1, lines 11 and 12 : Instead of "by the inclusion of Germany on the anti-Soviet front, the pacifism of the Social-Democrats is playing a principal part" read "these efforts of Social-Democracy for 'arbitration' play a leading part because they deflect the attention of the workers and peasants, and concealed the forced pace at which the war is being prepared from them."

Last page, column 2, line 7 : Instead of "the only real opponent of the Versailles peace system in Germany" read "the only real leader of the struggle against the Versailles peace system in Germany."

Same page : Last sentence to be struck out, instead read "The Social-Democracy is indivisibly bound up with capitalism to the last. Without the destruction of the Social-Democracy the working-class cannot overthrow capitalism, cannot emancipate itself. The Communist Parties are duty bound to help the working-class to create this pre-condition of the victory over the class enemy, naturally in unbroken and bitter struggle against him. The working-class under the leadership of the Communists must and will fulfil this task."

THE MINORITY IN THE FRENCH UNITED GENERAL CONFEDERATION OF LABOUR IN THE SERVICE OF THE BOURGEOISIE

THE minority leaders of the French United General Confederation of Labour at the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Profintern, tried their utmost to prove that there are persons at the head of the United Confederation of Labour who are guilty of all the existing weaknesses and shortcomings of the French united trade union movement. They responded to every indication of their own disorganising work, with a shower of "facts" to prove that the present leaders of the United General Confederation of Labour are worse opportunists and more useless leaders of the revolutionary trade union movement. It was to be expected that this method of discussion would now be continued in France, and, judging from past experience, they will be able in this way for a short time to continue to deceive the workers. It is probable also that certain leaders of the United General Confederation of Labour will follow the same road in polemics with the leaders of the minority—and will begin to discuss the question of who has made most mistakes.

In order to understand the true nature of the minority and in order to be in a position to fight successfully against them, we must first of all take a trip back into the history of the French labour movement. The French labour movement on the whole developed like that of other countries. During the war of 1914 the French bourgeoisie, backed by the treacherous leaders—Jouhaux, Blum, Renaudel, et tutti quanti, converted the French Socialist Party and the French reformist trade unions into accessories for carrying out their chauvinist, imperialist policy.

In the course of the 1914-1918 war, and especially after the victory of the great October Revolution, and under its direct influence, the French proletariat—again, like the proletariat of other countries—began to leave the old leaders in masses and to quit the old organisation of the United General Confederation of Labour and the Socialist Party.

Thus the Communist Party of France and the United General Confederation of Labour grew up at one and the same time, closely linked up by a common political platform, backed by the political line of the Communist International and the R.I.L.U., in consequence of which from the very beginning the existence of the C.G.T.U. Communist Fraction inside the Confederation played an undoubtedly leading rôle. Among

those who were dissatisfied with the old Socialist and reformist leaders and joined the revolutionary platform of the C.G.T.U. was the majority of the leaders of the Minority, for example, Rambeau, Engler, Chambellan and others. The United General Confederation of Labour (as well as the Communist Party of France) was composed of the more revolutionary elements of the Socialist Party of France and the French General Confederation of Labour. As in other countries, so in France, side by side with the red proletarian revolutionaries, there entered into these organisations also unstable elements, drawn in by the mighty revolutionary wave. In the ranks of the United General Confederation of Labour there could not but be also direct agents-provocateurs, sent in by police organisations in order to undermine the revolutionary trade union movement from inside. There is no doubt that when the French proletariat comes to power, corresponding documents will be found among the archives of the police and the Sureté Generale, which will include the reports of police provocateurs, informing their chiefs of how they made use of the waverers and doubters in the ranks of the Communist Party and the United General Federation of Labour, as cat's-paws for the purpose of accomplishing the work of the police, to disorganise the working class, break strikes, and smash up international campaigns, etc.

After the first wave of revolution, in France, just as in other countries, the ebb-tide which followed brought about a re-grouping in the ranks of the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade union movement; the resignation of certain leaders and the expulsion of others who were found incapable of carrying the Communist banner, or were guilty of disintegrating the ranks of the revolutionary proletariat by their activities. France has a considerable number of one-time Communists of this sort and of bankrupt political leaders who sympathise with Communism. One might mention as examples: Monatte, Rosmer, Souvairine, Train, Engler, Paze, Sellier, Garcherie and others.

The biggest re-groupings inside the French Communist movement began—as it did in other capitalist countries—after the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, in connection with the acute intensification of the general crisis of capitalism which had already begun, and as a result of the adoption in practice by the Com-

munist Parties and the revolutionary trade union organisations of the new line of tactics, fixed by the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, for the independent launching of class struggles of the proletariat and the preparation for a revolutionary way out of the imminent, deep economic crisis.

As a result of these re-groupings, during the period between the X. and XI. Plenums of the E.C.C.I. (approximately during the course of two years) seven members of the E.C.C.I. have been excluded for opportunist deviations from the line of the Communist International and for breaches of party discipline, and, moreover, the leadership in twelve Communist parties has been completely changed; further, where there was any hesitation in removing opportunist elements from the leading organs of the Party, considerable complications arose in the Party life of the organisations, and there were even cases of acute crises as, for example, in the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia. In Czecho-Slovakia, again, the inevitable consequence of the hesitation and weakness shown in the struggle against opportunism in the Party, was more hesitation and weakness in the struggle against reformist tendencies in the ranks of the revolutionary trade union movement, which resulted in the split in the ranks of the revolutionary trade unions. Meanwhile, the opportunist minority, using the advantage of the fact that the apparatus was in its hands and the documents appertaining to movable and immovable property of the revolutionary trade unions taken out in the names of renegades, and also backed by direct assistance from the police, seized all the property of the trade unions. Just like the leaders of the French minority now, so the overwhelming majority of the Czecho-Slovakian trade union renegades, were members of the Communist Party and inside the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia violently defended opportunist views, and protested against the dictatorship of Moscow leaders who mechanically used so-called Russian methods and were unable to understand the peculiarities of the Czecho-Slovakian working class movement.

The minority leaders at the meeting of the Executive Committee of the Profintern most eloquently proved that in France the trade union movement is developed according to "special laws." By these assertions they only reveal their extraordinary narrowness and ignorance concerning questions of the international labour movement. The French minority were not at all original in this respect. Two years previously the renegade of the Czecho-Slovakian Communist Party, the President of the Czecho-Slovakian revolutionary trade unions, Heiss, split the

Czecho-Slovakian trade unions. That the French minority supporters are about to do the same is quite easily proved, as is also the fact that whether they want to or not, they are acting as true, class-conscious agents-provocateurs of the French bourgeoisie inside the revolutionary trade union movement.

One peculiarity of the French working class movement is indeed this, that the re-grouping inside the United General Confederation of Labour has begun somewhat late. This peculiarity is primarily explained by the might of French imperialism which, basing its supremacy on the spoils of the Versailles and other post-war pacts and agreements, and also counting on the weakness of the Communist Party of France, has been able to a certain extent to postpone the intensification of the present economic crisis. But the economic crisis has already stepped across the French border, and as a result the more rapid development of unemployment, the increasing attacks of the bourgeoisie upon the toiling masses, the growing revolutionary activities of the masses, the growth of the Communist Party and the United General Confederation of Labour are all equally inevitable, and inevitable in consequence is the simultaneous further exit of wavering and opportunist elements, who were afforded from the very beginning assistance by the secret and open agents of the bourgeoisie.

Indeed, the growing revolutionary activity of the masses confronts the bourgeoisie with the need of adopting certain preventive measures. These measures, apparently, must first of all be directed against the Communist Party and against the United General Confederation of Labour. The usual means used by the bourgeoisie in its struggle against the working class movement are direct repressions and disorganisation from inside the movement. The French bourgeoisie, like that of other countries, uses both means. They use repressions and carry on internal disorganizational work in the Communist Party and the United General Confederation of Labour. In no country are the leaders of reformist trade unions quite so compromised by collaboration with the bourgeoisie, as they are in France. With its present reputation, the General Confederation of Labour, apparently, is very little adapted to the work of strangling the strike movement.

Most compromised in the eyes of the workers is the leader of the reformist General Confederation of Labour himself—Jouhaux. Being a representative of Imperialist France at the League of Nations, he is in receipt of an enormous ministerial salary, lives in high style, maintains his own elegant mistresses and so on, which, after all, hardly harmonises with growing unemploy-

ment, the increased cost of living and falling wages. Of late the workers have not been desirous of listening to this gentleman.

Hence the direct desire of the bourgeoisie that the General Federation of Labour should make some "left" manœuvres and put forward political leaders who are popular among the masses to take the place of the odious Jouhaux. It is just now that the General Confederation of Labour is doing its utmost to study "left" phraseology, basing their piece-meal slogans, which are directed towards breaking the resistance of the proletariat to the attacks of the bourgeoisie, upon high-sounding revolutionary phrases.

Of late the figure of Dumoulens has come into evidence as the new leader of the working class in France. Dumoulens for the last few years has stood aloof from the trade union movement; he combined his work in the Socialist municipality with work in the administrative council of the Central organ of the French Socialist Party, the "Populaire." This experienced jobber of social-fascism put forward the idea of unity in the trade union movement and the liberation of the trade unions from dependence upon political parties. The first debut of Dumoulens in this rôle was made by him in the name of the so-called Committee of Twenty-two, in union with the leaders of the minority—Chambellan, Rambot, Engler and so on.

It is not difficult to see that from the point of view of the radical interests of French imperialism, this is a clever manœuvre which, unfortunately, is all too insufficiently made use of by the Communist Party of France and the United General Confederation of Labour. The working masses are rising up in struggle. They are spontaneously drawn towards unity in their ranks. They are beginning to turn their backs upon Jouhaux. The bourgeoisie must at all costs prevent the Communists and the united trade unions from getting the workers. Therefore, the "left" leader Dumoulens is pushed to the forefront. Therefore, the French bourgeoisie are anxious that Dumoulens should be supported by the minority elements like Rambot, Engler, Beauville and so on. On behalf of the most vital interests of the French bourgeoisie, Dumoulens and the leaders of the minority, using "left" phrases, have begun to manœuvre for unity among the trade unions, holding the view, at the same time, that the reformist General Confederation of Labour has ceased to take part in the class struggle. In the Committee of Twenty-two, of which Dumoulens is in actual fact the leader, he formally occupies a very modest position; the foreground is occupied by the minority leaders, who have of late manifested considerable activity.

The French proletarians must weigh up these activities of the minority leaders in the most cautious, critical manner.

The first thing that became immediately apparent from their speeches at the Executive Committee of the Profintern was their foul double-dealing. In reply to concrete questions as to whether they consider the decisions of the Profintern binding upon them, they answered as one man that of course they recognised that; yet they at the same time made the stipulation that they recognise these instructions only in so far as they concern general questions of the trade union movement, but do not touch the inner questions of those minority organisations which they represent; which in practice means that they do not recognise the instructions of the Profintern.

Beauville and Rambot spoke very eloquently about their membership of the Profintern, and that they have no desire to break with the Profintern; but at the same time they were just as categorical in their avowals of unwavering loyalty to the Committee of Twenty-two. From all the leaders of the minority present at the Executive Committee, those present heard at least a dozen assurances to the effect that they are in sympathy with the Communist Party, and yet at the same time their utterances were one continual attack against the Communist Party of France and against the leaders of the united trade unions who are in agreement with the Communist Party of France. In a word the behaviour of the minority leaders at the meeting of the Executive Bureau of the Profintern was that of enemies, especially when it was a question of their attitude towards the Communist Party of France and the United General Confederation of Labour. However, every time any comrade from the Executive Bureau put the question direct—well then, the minority folk are against the Profintern and the United General Confederation of Labour—Rambot and Co.—immediately made a volte face and began to expand about their loyalty to Communism, Revolution and the U.S.S.R.

Such double-dealing on the part of the minority leaders cannot be put down to any personal attributes. During the course of the discussion it could frequently be seen how the docker Engler constantly shrunk when Beauville and Rambot made their angry onslaught against the Profintern, and yet Engler every time emphasised the fact that he was in complete solidarity with them on these questions. Engler had no other course to take, for "noblesse oblige"; and the minority leaders are not in a position to take up another line, for a close examination of their concrete political position clearly shows all the cunning mechanism of the new betrayal of the workers,

which is being prepared now by the French bourgeoisie and their agents in the camp of the leaders of the General Confederation of Labour.

The chief point of disagreement with the majority of the United General Confederation of Labour is considered by the leaders of the minority to be the fact that the majority recognises the leading rôle of the Communist Party. What is the leading rôle of the Communist Party in the trade union movement? It means that the Communist Party is backed up by the support and confidence of the majority of the members of the trade union; that backed by this confidence and support, the Communist Party controls the chief leading positions in the trade union apparatus, and that in the presence of this important factor, the Communist Party is in a position actually to lead all the activities of the trade unions. The minority leaders are directly opposed to this state of affairs. With many references to the fact that they are in favour of complete independence from political parties for the trade unions, they themselves carry on a policy of excluding trade union workers who are Communists from the membership of united trade union organisations, in which the minority leaders play a leading rôle (for instance, the expulsion of Comrade Rocamond from the Food-Workers' Union, which is under the leadership of rampant minority supporters like Beauville).

The minority leaders declare that on questions of a general trade union character they are entirely and wholly in agreement with the Profintern. But at the same time at the Fifth Congress of the United General Confederation of Labour and after, the minority leaders systematically emphasised the fact that they are not in agreement with the estimation of the international situation given by the Fourth and Fifth Congresses of the Profintern. Chambellan at the Fifth Congress of the United General Confederation of Labour categorically declared that there is no crisis in capitalism at all, that capitalism is strengthening and that the end of the further growth of capitalism is not yet in sight. Beauville, at the meeting of the Executive Bureau of the Profintern, in August, 1931, on the whole made a repetition of these Chambellan characteristics, and subjected to the sharpest form of criticism all Communists who talk about any kind of radicalisation of the masses.

These assertions are even more Right than the position taken up by the German Brandlerites. The minority leaders go further than the social-fascists, since even the Vienna Congress of the Second International, was obliged to admit both that capitalism is not developing at all, and that unrest among the masses is growing rapidly.

Beauville and Rambot even now apparently see nothing of this and do not know, apparently, that the total number of unemployed has already exceeded 20 millions; apparently they know nothing of such facts which point to the radicalisation of the masses as, for instance, the Chinese revolution, the present mass revolutionary struggle in Indo-China and India, the Spanish revolution; apparently facts such as the developing political crises in Germany and in Poland, the strike among the miners and textile workers in France in 1931, and so on, are entirely unknown to them. All the minority supporters—or at least all their leaders—are well aware of these facts, and if they speak to the contrary, it is merely because they are anxious that the proletariat should imagine that the capitalist system is absolutely firm, and that for the time being there are actually no serious struggles among the working class going on, and therefore there is no sense in listening to the Communists and the United General Confederation of Labour, who call upon the French workers to wage war in their own interests and to support the revolutionary struggle of toilers in other lands.

The minority leaders loudly affirm that they are the true friends of the U.S.S.R. It should be added in parenthesis that even sincere social-interventionists like Rozenfeld from the "Populaire," call themselves friends of the U.S.S.R., in the presence of the working class. But very characteristic of the Dumoulens, loving friends of the U.S.S.R., is the position they adopt on the question of the war danger. The minority leaders do not believe in the imminence of the new imperialist war and the more so in the imminence of intervention against the U.S.S.R. At the meeting of the Executive Bureau of the Profintern, Beauville and Periniens most eloquently proved how disastrous was the slogan of the Communist Party in connection with the struggle against the new imminent imperialist war. They said that the Communists would cry wolf so often about the imminence of war that the proletariat, so often deceived by these cries, would not act at the critical moment, believing that they were being deceived yet once again. What does this attitude to the question amount to?

The trials carried on in connection with the Industrial Party and the Mensheviks showed clearly enough that the business of preparing a new intervention against the U.S.S.R. had already in 1930 gone far enough.

By the beginning of 1931 it transpired that America even was prepared to take on the rôle of "quartermaster" on behalf of all the armies of intervention. France was at the head of this new counter-revolutionary advance. Can we say

that the position of French imperialism has changed since then? As a result of the fact that France has now been drawn into the economic crisis, and of the necessity for re-grouping forces for a military attack upon the U.S.S.R., negotiations were initiated with the U.S.S.R. on the subject of a pact of non-aggression. But is it not obvious that these negotiations and the pact itself, if it is ever signed, is nothing but a smoke-screen on the part of French imperialism, to camouflage the continued preparations for intervention against the U.S.S.R.? And in circumstances such as these, we find the minority leaders calling themselves the "friends of the U.S.S.R.," and trying to lay aside the question of struggling against the danger of new intervention against the U.S.S.R. At the Executive Bureau of the Profintern, Rambot was asked what he thought about the articles in the minority organ "Proletarian Revolution" concerning the conflict on the Chinese-Eastern Railway in 1929. In these articles the entire blame for the conflict was laid upon the "red militarism" of the U.S.S.R. Rambot replied cynically that he had not read these articles and could not therefore reply to the question put to him.

It seems that without having read the articles in the "Proletarian Revolution," Rambot and Beauville and Engler, nevertheless, had done everything they could to make the August 1 and May 1 campaigns a failure, under the pretext that the United General Confederation of Labour had made bad preparations for them. Must we consider the fact that the practical position of the minority leaders coincides with the plans of the ruling classes and their executive organ, the police, to be a mere accident?

In a word, the position of the minority leaders, who are alleged to be in sympathy with the Communist Party of France and wish to go hand-in-hand with the Profintern, upon all the most important questions mentioned above, coincides exactly with the position of the reformist leaders and the Socialist Party. The one single difference is to be found in the high-sounding "left" phrases which they use expressly for the purpose of deceiving the masses.

It is the same as regards the economic struggle. During the preparations made by the United General Confederation of Labour in connection with the recent miners' strike, the minority organisations of the miners of Loire, published a special leaflet which called upon the workers of Loire, in plain black and white, not to respond to the call of the United General Confederation of Labour, and denounced the leaders of the United General Confederation of Labour as madmen and provoca-

teurs. The minority leaders in reply to questions put to them by members of the Executive Bureau of the Profintern on the subject of what they understand by trade union discipline, replied that they are in favour of unconditional, firm discipline during struggles. However, behaviour such as that evinced by the minority leaders of the Loire miners' organisation, has always been called, and is still called in all countries—blacklegging. The minority leaders were strike-breakers during the last strike of the textile workers, when in their central organ, "Cri du Peuple," they praised the reformist leaders for their "impeccable behaviour"; and when, instead of responding to the appeal of the United General Confederation of Labour to continue the strike against the decision of the General Confederation of Labour to go back to work, the "Cri du Peuple" declared that the question could not be solved with the existing lack of unity in the trade union movement.

Finally, the true nature of the minority leaders was made especially obvious in practice in connection with the way in which they carried out the main slogan concerning trade union unity.

At the Executive Bureau of the Profintern, Beauville should have confessed that he had actually made a proposition to Engler to organise a bakers' union, parallel with the United Organisation of Bakers, which supports the United General Confederation of Labour against Beauville and his friends. The expulsion of fifty-four local organisations of the union for loyalty to the United General Confederation of Labour, which was put through at the insistence of Beauville, was just such another fact of open splitting activity. Beauville himself, as indicated previously, succeeded in expelling a member of the E.C. of the United General Confederation of Labour, Racamond, from the union, because of his Communist convictions. Another mainstay of the minority, Rambot, who had entered into a sort of competition with Beauville at the Executive Bureau of the Profintern, in order to find out who could be the most cynical, wangled the voting at the recent Congress of railway workers of the State railways, according to the number of votes instead of the number of members, which is against all the traditions of the French trade union movement, and as a result of which the minority supporters gained a majority at the Congress of 7,933 majority members against the minority of 10,864 members. Rambot also asked Engler to assist him in the organisation of a few new unions to be represented at the Congress. The whole aim of this device was quite obvious after the Congress.

All these facts lead us to confirm most categorically that "leaders" of the minority like

Rambot, Chambellan, Beauville and others like them are agents of French imperialism inside the united trade union movement, since their whole political line, their practical and political work, follows entirely the road which satisfies the most vital interests of French imperialism.

It is not the slightest accident that the estimate given by the minority leaders of the political line of the United General Confederation of Labour and its methods of work coincides in every point, with statements written about the United General Confederation of Labour by official representatives of the bourgeoisie like Charles Duleau, the editor of "Socialist Information" (publication of the "Temps") or the organ of the heavy industries, the "Comite du Forge." Moreover, each of them, just like the minority leaders, are the stoutest defenders of the so-called "independence" of the trade unions.

It is not for nothing that the Communist Party of France and the United General Confederation of Labour are obliged to bring these attestations of Charles Duleau and the "Comite du Forge" to the cognisance of the broad masses of the French proletariat and, primarily, to the members of the united organisations which still support the minority leaders. It is absolutely essential to reveal the true character of Rambot, Beauville and Chambellan and Co. and also to make clear the foul rôle played by proletarians like Engler, who having entangled themselves in Communist Party questions, have now become the true "Madchens fur Alles" of the most virulent enemies of the working class. In order to understand how far Engler has gone along this path, despite the fact that he, of all the minority leaders, is the one that stands out among them for his connection with the masses, we might mention the help given by him to Rambot and Beauville in the work of creating parallel trade unions for the railwaymen and food-workers, and also the fact that in Rouen he has already, himself, created an unemployed organisation, parallel to that which already exists, with special membership cards and rates of subscriptions.

Beauville and Rambot complained a great deal at the Executive Bureau of the Profintern of the fact that attempts are being made to split the united trade unions, since efforts were made in 1929 to throw them out of the leadership of the united trade unions. Yes, I proposed, and now repeat my proposal, that the minority leaders should be removed from the leadership of the United General Confederation of Labour. This operation must be done not by the Profintern, not by the United General Confederation of Labour, but by the rank and file working class members of the united trade unions themselves, on the basis

of trade union discipline. This act will not be one to split the united trade unions, but will be an absolutely essential measure which must be taken to cleanse the unions of all inimical elements. Just as the organism loses its fever and begins to get strong, as soon as the abscess has been lanced and the impure blood allowed to flow away, so will the United General Confederation of Labour, having rid itself of the microbes of reformist disintegration and decay in the form of the minority leaders, having cleared out of the leading organs all the friends of Dumoulens and other agents of the bourgeoisie, so will it grow and develop into a mighty force, ready to fight against the predatory, interventionist plans of French imperialism.

This article was already written when a fresh number of the "Cri du Peuple" (the central organ of the minority) of September 2 arrived, entirely devoted to the question of the discussion of the Executive Bureau meetings at the Profintern. The minority leaders are endeavouring to give the impression that they are innocent persons against whom criminal attacks are being made by the Profintern, led by Comrade Lozovsky. The arguments they use, moreover, are characteristic. They write: The French bourgeoisie are attacking the working class, yet at the same time the Soviet Government negotiates with the Briand-Lavalle Government, and Lozovsky attacks the minority leaders." All these arguments amount to the usual hackneyed, cunning manoeuvring of the Mensheviks of all lands, who shout "Stop thief!" in order to divert attention away from their own artful operations. Who will believe that the Soviet Government in the course of its negotiations with the Lavalle Government will make any concessions against the interests of the Soviet and French workers? The Soviet Government has always carried on, and will continue to carry on, negotiations with capitalist governments, thus following the wise advice of Lenin, in order to lengthen the breathing space, and in order to make good use of it for the development of trading relations, in which both sides are interested, before the event of war.

The whole world knows that these negotiations do not prevent the Soviet Government in its own country from launching still further its Socialist advance, from liquidating the kulaks as a class and so on. Similarly, as the whole world knows, the collaboration of Jouhaux and Dumoulens with the League of Nations has always helped, and will continue to help, to worsen the material position of the working class. Neither should anyone be deceived by the complaints of the minority leaders to the effect that the Profintern is discrediting them during the advance of the bosses

upon the workers' standard of living. The Pro-fintern is obliged to unmask the minority leaders, for they are not only making no attempt to organise the struggle against the advance of the bosses, but on the contrary are preventing this

struggle, as was the case in the recent strikes among the textile workers and miners, and they, in general, are working to disorganise the ranks of the working class.

B. VASSILIEV.

REPORT OF THE MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE BUREAU OF THE R.I.L.U., HELD ON AUGUST 17, 1931

*Discussion on Comrade Lozovsky's Report.**

THE CHAIRMAN, COMRADE GERMANETTO, declares the meeting of the Executive Bureau open. Comrade Abolin, the Secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, has the floor.

ABOLIN: Comrades,—The preceding speaker, Comrade Lozovsky, dealt yesterday in his long speech with the basic questions of the French T.U. movement, in connection with the activities of the minoritarians. I wholly agree with his estimation of the situation, with his conclusions, and support the questions he put to the reporters. I will add very little.

I will touch upon three points only.

Firstly, a few words as regards the general estimation of the reports made by the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. I think that it will be interesting for the French comrades to learn the opinion of a worker of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, even if he repeats to a certain extent what was already mentioned by other comrades. Secondly, I think it necessary to emphasise some lessons of the Russian revolution and Russian T.U. movement, which are essentially important for the French T.U. movement. And, thirdly, I shall deal in more detail with the conditions of the proletariat in the Soviet Union. As to this latter question, the enemies of the U.S.S.R. spread a good many lies and slanders, and sometimes, as can be seen by the example of Comrade *Perignon*, mislead even the separate representatives of the workers. You remember how Comrade *Perignon*, after having by the way acquainted himself with two factories which he visited in Moscow, made a rash conclusion that the conditions of the French working class are better than those of the Soviet proletariat.

The reports "on the situation and work" of three French federations, led by the minoritarians, i.e., dockers, food workers and state railway workers, were on the agenda of the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. The comrades minoritarians have not at once consented to make such reports to the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U.

* Comrade Lozovsky's report was published in the last issue.

During our first talk it took several hours of discussion before the leaders of the minoritarians consented to our proposal to make these reports. In one of the articles which I read in the oppositional press of the minoritarians I found an absurd statement saying that the invitation of the leaders of the minoritarians to Moscow by the R.I.L.U. should be considered as a wish of the R.I.L.U. to change its policy. And so they have come here with this wrong standpoint; not to make reports, but to judge.

There a statement was made saying that they were not going to make any reports on the situation and work of their federations. They, then, have come to discuss with us only the general questions of the French T.U. movement and to bring a charge against the R.I.L.U. and the U.G.C.L.

We told the comrades that the whole work of the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U., and of all sections of which the R.I.L.U. is composed, is conducted on the basis of the decisions of the Fifth Congress of the R.I.L.U. These decisions were collectively worked out by the delegates from all countries on the basis of the consideration of the experience of the world revolutionary T.U. movement, were unanimously adopted at the World Congress of the R.I.L.U., and are, therefore, obligatory for the Executive Bureau as well as for all the sections of which the R.I.L.U. is composed. Therefore, we intend to carry on a discussion not of the correctness of the decisions adopted by the Congress, but on the way these decisions are being carried out by them. We told them that proletarian democracy consists just in the collective working out of decisions in order to unanimously and fraternally carry out those decisions afterwards. No fighting proletarian organisation can exist without unity of will and unity of action. We told the comrades that the best and most desirable thing to do is to solve controversial questions of the movement on the basis of discussing the concrete activities of the federation. This method of discussion, namely, the consideration of the concrete questions of activities, paying attention to the peculiarities of the environment, may lead us to the adoption of

some decisions of a political character, while a general abstract discussion of the problems "in general" would hardly enable the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. to make any concrete conclusions from the conditions existing in France.

And, finally, we told the comrades that we were interested not only in their articles, statements and declarations of bald "principles," but in concrete deeds. We warned them that we should judge not by words but by deeds.

The comrades who arrived here have, after long arguments and objections, recognised the correctness of our considerations and consented to make reports to the R.I.L.U. on the situation and work of the three federations which they are leading.

How have our reporters fulfilled these pledges of theirs? I think unsatisfactorily. They passed over in silence the question of their carrying out of the decisions of the Fifth Congress of the R.I.L.U. They never referred in their reports to the decisions of the Congresses of the R.I.L.U. I am not sure that they acquainted the broad membership masses of their unions with the decisions of the Fifth Congress of the R.I.L.U. Having heard their reports, having analysed their speeches and statements here at the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U., I am convinced that they not only did not strive for the carrying out of these decisions, but, on the contrary, that they in every way hampered their realisation.

Comrade Boville, who is unfortunately absent to-day, made the following characteristic statement at the meeting of the Executive Bureau. "You are studying prospects, you are planning methods here. They are effective here in your country. They may be also effective in other countries. But for us, as a rule, these prospects and methods are ineffective."

What is the meaning of such a statement made by Boville? Boville is reviling beforehand the decisions of the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U., if they are not such as Boville wants to have them. He knows that they will not be such as he would like. Boville knows that the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U., which is on guard of proletarian democracy, will never pass decisions that will not suit the will of the majority of organisations affiliated to the R.I.L.U.

Comrades, I would like to remind you of the report of the All-Union C.C. of T.U., which I made a few months ago to the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. In our report to the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. we rendered an account as regards each point of the decisions of the Fifth Congress. We, the representatives of the Soviet trade unions, heard the criticism of the represen-

tatives of other sections of the R.I.L.U., which was very valuable for us, and accepted all the directives of the R.I.L.U. We perfectly well understand that the power of the world revolutionary movement consists just in our having the unanimous will to carry out the decisions we had collectively worked out.

We may argue at our congresses, but we are all of us obliged to carry out the decisions adopted, be it Soviet trade unions, or the C.G.T.U. or separate federations, whatever their political views are. Therefore, *we want a quite clear answer to the question of the attitude of the minoritarian comrades towards the decisions of the Fifth Congress of the R.I.L.U. and of the way they are carrying out those decisions.*

The Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. is not an arena for juridical manoeuvres and various machinations of intriguers. Not a single honest proletarian, not a single genuine proletarian organisation will ever give mandates to their representatives, authorising them to manoeuvre at the meetings of the supreme organ of the revolutionary T.U. movement, at the meetings of the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. And in what a hostile and caricature way do the minoritarians treat the most important question of the revolutionary movement—that of the unity of will of the organisations—opposing in the wrong way the unity of will and action to the independence of an organisation. Comrade Boville said in the same speech, a part of which I quoted here: "I refer to Monmousseau, Racemond, and to many others. I knew them as very important persons, as persons to whom the proletariat would listen. But to-day they are irreconisable. Being used to obedience and fearing to wander from the line they have become automatons," and so on and so forth. I will not repeat here the various epithets Comrade Boville applied to our comrades leading the C.G.T.U.

The accusation of automatism and absence of initiative of all those who have firm political views, who seriously pledge themselves to proletarian class discipline, who understand the whole seriousness of class struggle, used to be the favourite method of all opportunists, of all those who waver, who are afraid of responsibility, who want "freedom," not in order to actively participate in the class struggle, but to desert the front of struggle. Boville's accusation of the French leading comrades just recalls, in this case, those accusations which the enemies of the working class have poured and are pouring on the Bolsheviks. Such accusations reflect the hatred which the spineless people feel towards irreconcilability, and which the petty-bourgeois elements feel towards the

representatives of the most consistent of all the classes—the proletariat.

All of you know that the Soviet movement is an instance of the movement of the numberless masses of proletarians who are carrying on one common political line with the Communist Party and are executing in closed ranks the colossal task of socialist construction under the conditions of the intensification of class struggle within the country and with the hostile capitalist environment outside. We, the Soviet trade unions, say, openly before the whole world, that we are proud that the huge proletariat of our country has a unified firm will to execute the decisions it has collectively worked out. Who of you will venture to say that the members of the Soviet trade unions are automatons? You saw some of our factories and works. I don't know what your opinion was after having visited our works, but I hardly think that you would venture to declare that there you saw automatons. All who come here, be it representatives of the capitalist world in the person of Lord Astor, etc., be it our friends—workers, even belonging to various political tendencies—social democrats, social-nationalist, non-party men, or Communists—all mention the tremendous creative mass activity of the proletarian masses of the Soviet Union. The unity of line has not only not hindered but, on the contrary, it has secured our widest carrying out of proletarian democracy, attraction of new millions for the active participation in the political, economic and cultural life of the country.

I shall give, comrades, by way of information, a few figures of the activity of the trade unions of the U.S.S.R. We have an elected active group who work at the factory and shop committees and amount to 1,335,000 persons. This active section is the organiser of the economic, social, cultural and all other kinds of various work conducted by the Soviet trade unions. Apart from the elected T.U. active section, 2,270,000 persons, who comprise the volunteer "active," take active part in the enormous work of the Soviet trade unions. Thus the membership of the T.U. "active" alone in the U.S.S.R. amounts to 3,600,000 persons. So you see, comrades, what a number of people are able to apply their activity, creative genius on condition of the carrying on of the general line of the Party and of the Soviet T.U. movement. You will have the opportunity to check my statement at any factory of ours, at any works.

Compare these figures with the characterisation Comrade Boville gave to the "active" of his Federation. Comrade Boville said that his Union is a small one, but that it has many militants. "This," he said, "is the power of our Union, but it is also its weakness, as many dissatisfied ambi-

tions remain." A rather nice "mass activity," if one has to complain of "dissatisfied ambitions" of the "active," taking into consideration that less than 1 per cent. of food workers are organised in the French Unions of Food Workers! There are about $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. organised in the Food Workers' Union! 99 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. more should be organised. These masses should be prepared for class struggles. But there can be no actual defence of the vital interests of the masses, no activity of the masses—under the policy of the minoritarians, though Boville maintains the monopoly of the minoritarians on the representation of the activity and vital interests of the masses, pushing aside the communists, active leaders of the C.G.T.U. This is what activity means, according to Boville's opinion, and is what activity means—in the conditions of the carrying out of the unified line of the Soviet T.U. movement.

So you can judge, then, which creates better conditions for the activity of the masses: a unified line, collectively worked out and unanimously carried on, or the disorganising policy of the minoritarians, disputing the will of the majority.

It jarred on my ear when the minoritarians present here talked of the activities of the French T.U. movement, chiefly in connection with their own demonstrations, speeches, and actions. The collective whole, the organisation—disappeared in their speeches, and I involuntarily thought: what, then, is the Food Workers' Union? Is it Boville? Is the Railwaymen's Union Rambaud and some other comrades working directly with him, or is it a live, creative organisation?

Speaking of activity, of the attraction of the masses for leadership, I must most sharply emphasise the absolutely wrong estimation of the rôle of the youth in the T.U. movement, made by Boville. "As to the youth," he said, "I have already told you that the youth can work miracles on the political field, but are not adapted to the trade union ground." With such an attitude towards the young cadres it is impossible to train new strata of militants, who are needed for the solution of enormous tasks which are confronted by the French Labour movement. There is a different attitude towards the youth in the Soviet trade unions. Take any of our elected organs, be it the Presidium of the All-Union C.C. of T.U., the Central Committee of one of our 44 Unions, or a rank and file elected T.U. organ—we secure everywhere the active participation of the youth. We cannot repeat Boville's statement with regard to our Soviet youth, we cannot say that our youth do not suit for work in the trade unions. On the contrary, our congresses, our conferences, have repeatedly noted the great activity of the youth

and its fruitful rôle in the work of the trade unions. We have the right to pride ourselves upon our youth. In our Soviet trade union movement the representatives of youth very often successfully carry out leading work. Is it correct to say that the French T.U. youth are absolutely unsuitable for T.U. work? Do other comrades support such an opinion? I think that this opinion is slanderous as regards the French youth.

Out of the three co-reporters here, one was the representative of the youth. I do not know the opinions of other members of the Executive Bureau, but I consider the speech of this young comrade at any rate not worse than Boville's speech. I think that this comrade showed his good knowledge of the Federation and of its tasks (one may agree or disagree with him, this is a question of policy, a question of a definite point of view), and as regards his political and theoretical level and ability to put and to deal with questions, his report was better than that of Boville. Isn't it so, comrades?

I must note one more particularity: no mention was made in your reports, comrades minoritarians, of the working women, of the rôle of the working women in the movement, but there are about 40 per cent. of women amongst the French proletarians. We have got a smaller number of women workers, comrades; there are only 29 per cent. of women amongst the workers in the U.S.S.R. and, none the less, there are 12 per cent. of women amongst the responsible workers of the All-Union C.C. of T.U. The chairmen of six Committees of trade unions, each of which unites several hundred thousand workers, are women workers. We have 18 per cent. of women on the Committees of all the trade unions, 20 per cent. of the women are on the shop committees, and the rôle of women in the Soviet T.U. movement is very great. The Soviet working women are the powerful reserve of T.U. cadres. We are drawing these new fresh strata of working women into general work. And we have not to complain of "dissatisfied ambitions."

Comrades, only on condition of an attentive attitude towards new forces, promotion of genuine revolutionaries from the rank and file masses, listening to their opinions, working shoulder to shoulder with them, supporting them in their work and promoting them to more and more responsible posts—only on these conditions is it possible to create a powerful trade union "active" which will be able to cope with the most complicated, most difficult and most responsible tasks confronting the working class.

What is the class content of the reports of the minoritarian leaders? Who will applaud Boville, Bambaud, etc.?

You attacked the line of the R.I.L.U. and C.G.T.U., you tried at all costs to discredit the French Communist Party before the world T.U. movement. You denied the fighting capacity of the French proletariat. You—with the exception of Comrade Engler, who referred here to some instances of the fighting capacity of the proletariat—have declared here of your distrust in the forces of the French proletariat, you denied the successes it achieved, you denied the consolidation of its revolutionary spirit. You stood up for the sham peacefulness of French imperialism, trying to lull the watchfulness of the world labour movement. You tried to rehabilitate the leaders of reformism, saying that the latter have led very good strikes, whereas the trade unions, led by the Communists, have not had such good strikes. Your blows were directed against the Communists, against the majority of the C.G.T.U.

I ask you, comrades, who declares against Comintern and the R.I.L.U. and carries on the policy of discrediting this world revolutionary proletarian organisation? In whose interests are these speeches, this attack?

I ask in whose interests is it to lull the class consciousness, to crush the belief in the forces of the proletariat, to belittle the success of the proletarian struggle and of socialist construction?

The task of the revolutionary T.U. movement is to help the proletariat to sense its own forces, to teach the workers how to link up each step of the struggle for the concrete every-day demands with the basic, fundamental tasks of the proletariat.

Do you think, comrades, that with us, in Russia, there were few failures, few smashed strikes—prior to the victory of the October Revolution? The revolution of 1905 was drowned in blood. We recall mass shootings of the workers' strikes and demonstrations. I think there is no necessity to explain how Tzarism fought against the working class. But had we, the workers of the Russian trade unions, we, bolsheviks, ever declared at the meetings that the proletariat—as Boville stated here—was dormant, that it could not succeed in the revolutionary struggle? We have never had such a disgrace. We were constantly preparing the proletarians for the future revolutionary battles; we showed them their power proceeding from the analysis of each strike. And even in the defeats we could recognise the power and might of the working class. After the revolution of 1905 we did not join with the Mensheviks who were saying, "We should not have taken up arms." On the contrary, we derived lessons from this revelation for the future victories of the proletariat. Do you think, comrades minoritarians, that we, with our unshaken faith in the

forces of the working class, were wrong? The October Revolution gave an answer to this question.

And are the Russian workers better than the French ones; is their origin or blood better? Certainly not. The fact is that the Russian workers had leaders who, contrary to the minoritarians in France, had faith in the forces of the proletariat and taught the proletariat to carry on revolutionary class struggle. I ask, in whose interests, in the interests of which class, are those speeches aiming at the distrust in the forces of the French proletariat, under-estimating the successes of the French proletariat? In the interests of French imperialism, in the interests of the whole international bourgeoisie. This is an indisputable fact.

How do the French bourgeoisie estimate the forces and revolutionary power of the French proletariat? Why, France had in 1930 25,000 gendarmes, and in 1925 there are 43,000.

(Lozovsky: It is in order to strengthen democracy.—Laughter.)

(A voice from the Hall: In order to strengthen T.U. democracy, in particular.)

Is it because the proletariat is dormant, feeble and impotent, as the minoritarian leaders would have it?

A few words on war. Comrade Lozovsky spoke very eloquently and convincingly enough yesterday. Comrades minoritarians, you state that there will be no war, as the bourgeoisie of France and of other countries are so afraid of the Soviet Union that they will not venture to declare a war on it. Why do you know this? What are those competent sources from which you derived your information of the plans of the French General Staff and of the General Staffs of other capitalist countries?

Is it a fact or not that the term of military service in France has been increased at present to 28 years of age as against 25? I am speaking of the general terms of service. Is it true or not? The general term of military service in France used to be to 25 years and at present it is to 28. And we must take into consideration the mechanisation of the army, the enormous development of military training in this army, its being armed with the newest achievements of war technique, etc. And Boville tells us here La Fontaine's fables!

Is it a fact or not that the French Government and the French vassals are supporting the Russian White-Guardists, Generals Miller, Lukomsky, etc., and openly encourage the work of these elements directed against the Soviet Union? Is it a fact or not that the French Courts, basing on forged documents, support the claims of all kinds

of suspicious criminal elements—to the economic organs of the U.S.S.R.—preparing for an economic blockade of the Soviets? It is just in France at present that such vile insinuations against the U.S.S.R., as the article of the Russian ex-millionaire, Ryabushinsky, who once tried to smash the Russian revolution by means of famine, could appear. You remember what Ryabushinsky had written in the "Revival," issued in Paris: "There is not an undertaking in the whole world," Ryabushinsky wrote, "which would not be more justified economically and more profitably than the liberation of Russia. Having spent one milliard roubles, mankind will get the profit of not less than five milliards, i.e. 500 per cent. of interest, with the prospect of the further increase of profit by 100-200 per cent. yearly."

Have not you, comrades minoritarians, been interested in the trial of the "Industrial Party" and mensheviks which proved to the whole world the war manoeuvres of the bourgeoisie against the U.S.S.R.? Don't you know that "Torgprom" jointly with the General Staff of France had even fixed the concrete date of the beginning of intervention against the U.S.S.R., which was intended at first in 1930, and then—in 1931? What would have happened if we and the proletariat of the world had followed you in ignoring the war danger? A war would have broken out, that is what would have happened, comrades minoritarians.

We can observe everywhere the colossal growth of war preparations. A series of necessary diplomatic and other measures of the capitalist powers, aiming at the organisation of a bloc of States against the U.S.S.R.—can be observed. We see the steadiest pressure on Germany, the object of which is to draw Germany into the sphere of active anti-Soviet influence. And, under these conditions, what else can we call your attitude towards the question of the danger of war against the U.S.S.R., if not the attitude of reformism directed, objectively or subjectively—this does not matter in the given case—to the support of the General Staffs in their preparations for an intervention against the Soviet Union? You not only do not draw the attention of the working class to the question of war preparations, you not only do not strengthen the watchfulness of the proletariat and its struggle against the war combinations of the imperialists. On the contrary you would have the proletariat helpless and passive in case of war, and ignorant of the ways of struggle against war in case it breaks out, despite the wishes and interests of the working class. In your statements as regards a war against the U.S.S.R. you are literally repeating those of the reformists as regards

the alleged "red imperialism" of the U.S.S.R.

Further, you said here that the reformists had conducted splendid strikes while the communists and federations led by the latter have not led such strikes. But, comrades, this is mere echoing the tunes sung by the bourgeoisie: a few instances showing why the bourgeoisie praise the reformists. The "Revue Politique" and the "Parlementaire" write that the "initiative of doctrinal proposals was taken up by the workers' organisations which does credit to syndicalism." "Bulletin Quotidienne," organ of the Metallurgy Committee, writes that the T.U. organisation of C.G.T. has under the present conditions shown sagacity and reasonableness, thus making a happy contrast with the old intolerance." The bourgeoisie praise the reformists, and so do you.

Comrades, you should understand that there is no reason for the bourgeoisie to have agents who exercise no influence of the workers. The bourgeoisie is interested in allowing the reformists to win some strikes. In France the bourgeoisie have still got necessary reserves for it.

And now I ask you, comrades, what is the class meaning of your reports? Who will applaud you if these reports are published in France? I think that the bourgeoisie and not the revolutionary elements of the French, working class will applaud you. This is definite.

Such is the exact meaning, in the terms of class struggle, of your long reports. Your attacks on the R.I.L.U., direct as well as indirect, isolated facts which are seldom true, and chiefly wrong and distorted but carefully selected against the majority of C.G.T.U.—all this is the basic content of your reports to the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U., entitled "On the situation and work of the federations."

And what did not you mention? You did not mention the prospects of the revolutionary struggle in your federations, the growing of the crisis. You made no mention whatever of the struggle of the immediate demands of the French proletariat, as they are formulated by the C.G.T.U. I shall not enumerate those demands here. You must know them yourselves. In a word, you avoided to mention all the fundamental questions of trade union work.

You were talking very much, you were talking in a general way, not concretely—of the originality and of the specific conditions existing in France, in the French T.U. movement. According to your opinion — the R.I.L.U. denies the singularity and complexity of the situation of T.U. movement in France. But such a view is nothing else than insolent mockery of the work and decisions of the R.I.L.U. You must be acquainted with that decision which was adopted

by the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. on the report of the C.G.T.U. at least. There these particularities were pointed out, — that France was later than other countries affected by the crisis, that there are present reserves of the bourgeoisie and the possibility to shift the burden of the crisis to the toilers of the defeated countries by means of utilising the Versailles Treaty of 1919 and utilising the profits of the robbery of colonies, and that the French bourgeoisie are able to bribe certain strata of labour aristocracy, and that there are harder conditions of struggle against reformism and difficulty in exposing reformism, taking into consideration the experienced and aggressive bourgeoisie.

I will not give an account of this resolution here, I only ask that you concretely add to this characterisation, what are your concrete corrections or additions. You have not set forth a single remark. You only alluded to the singularity which the R.I.L.U. did not take into consideration. You must agree that under such conditions it is difficult to fruitfully carry on a discussion. If you had been able to make concrete corrections, — we could have discussed them? The tasks formulated in this resolution of the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U., the characterisation of the situation in France,—do you dispute this? You have not mentioned anything concrete. What then, are you disputing, what point, which statement? In this resolution the necessity was stated of preparing for a counter offensive of the proletariat on the bourgeoisie, the methods of this offensive are pointed out. Boville said that the methods of the R.I.L.U. do not suit France. And what does suit? Why don't you give your concrete proposals? Because you have not got revolutionary methods, and those methods you have—you are ashamed to speak of.

Why I, a representative of the Soviet trade unions, began to speak of the singularity and particularity of the French T.U. movement. Why it is just I, the representative of the Soviet Trade unions, who, may be, knows France badly, began to speak here of the singularity of France, which should be taken into consideration. Because, comrades, much was said once of the particularities in the development of the revolutionary movement in Russia, all kinds of parties took advantage of these theories as well as various reactionary elements of the Russian labour movement. I will not remind you of those old quarrels of ours. But I wished to remind you only of the fact that Lenin and other comrades who worked together with him had to use much energy and force in order to smash the unscientific argument of those who stated that the laws of development of capitalism in Russia were fundamentally differ-

ent than those in the West, who rejected revolutionary Marxism and consistent revolutionary struggle, under the pretext, that the "schemes" of the West European movement could not be shifted to the Russian ground, that they were, perhaps, very good for France, for Germany or England, but were absolutely unsuitable for Russia. They invented charges against Marxism, stating as if Marxism mechanically shifts methods suitable in certain conditions to quite different surroundings, and behind the screen of this slanderous, unfounded charge—they ignored the international community of the tasks of the proletariat and were carrying on a struggle against the revolutionary movement. The bolsheviks had to strike a heavy blow on these theories of originality. And only because we have been armed by the revolutionary method of Marxism and rejected the unscientific reactionary talk of the laws of capitalist development and laws of proletarian struggle in Russia differing from those in the West,—we could be able to win a victory.

The experience of our revolution proved that the law of development and lessons of the international proletarian struggle are very useful to the Russian labour movement.

And now, when Boville said that the R.I.L.U. adopted good decisions for itself and that those decisions were suited perhaps for the work in other countries but were absolutely unsuitable for France,—I heard in his speech the echo of the old Russian "people's party," "economists," backward reactionary elements of the Russian labour movement whom it was necessary to crush in order to be able to realise the revolution. One should not forget that in those times Russia was the stronghold of reaction. To-day—the rôles have changed; to-day, France rightfully plays the rôle of the stronghold of world reaction, the rôle of an international gendarme. You know this better than I do. And to-day, these old theories—crushed on the Russian ground, on the ground of Russian revolutionary movement—are being revived by Boville for France.

Comrades, we are taking into consideration the experience of the world T.U. movement. That is why the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U. and the French T.U. movement should fight those reactionary Boville's theories with zeal and vim. Only having rid themselves of these theories—having crushed these reactionary theories—the French trade unions will be able to prepare the proletariat of France for the forthcoming revolutionary battles.

Comrades, the "theories" of Boville, and of his supporters are in the interests of those who are fighting against the revolutionary methods of

class struggle, against the way of October, they are in the interests of those who attempt to split the unity of the world T.U. movement on a national base, they are in the interests of those who dislike the revolutionary theory of Marx and Lenin.

We, the workers of the Russian trade unions, referring to the experience of the Proletarian Revolution in Russia, are telling you; the revolutionary theory of Marx and Lenin has been checked in the practice of millions and millions, and it secured our victory in October. Are you prepared, comrades, to march together with us on the way to October, — Comrade Boville, Rambaud and those who are with you? It depends on you. Remember — you will never change the laws of revolution. We will not stop our struggle against those who fight the line of the R.I.L.U. and the organisation of the united front on the basis of class struggle. We will not stop our struggle against these "theories" of originality. We will struggle for the teaching of Marx—Lenin, against the theory of the independence of economic struggle of the proletariat from the political struggle, against the theory of "neutrality" and "independence" of trade unions, against the theory of peaceful particularities of the French bourgeoisie, against the theory of the somnolency of the French working class, against all other anti-proletarian theories which are growing in French soil. We will fulfil our duty of proletarian revolutionaries who know that there can be no revolutionary struggle without a revolutionary theory.

And, finally, the third and last part of my speech in which I will touch upon the condition of the working class in the Soviet Union.

Comrade Perignon said at the meeting of the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U.: "We understand and appreciate the enormous work done by the Russian revolution, we do not forget about those difficulties which it had to confront and which it has been confronting up to the present. We are sure that these difficulties will be overcome. Believe us, that after we have returned to France we will not belittle your achievements,—just on the contrary." Comrade Perignon, we don't want everybody to exaggerate our achievements. The proletariat of the Soviet Union, its trade unions, its Party and Government are creating socialist society, — are doing the work on a world historical scale of utmost importance. And believe me, comrades, minorities, we know what we are worth and absolutely need not your condescending opinions, moreover as these opinions, it seems to me, are insincere.

We have met here in order to tell the truth to

one another. And so, Comrade Perignon tries to establish this "truth." "The observations,—he says, "which we have made during a few days of our stay in Moscow, allow us to state, and the members of the Executive Bureau who are aware of the state of things in France (at any rate they must be aware of it) cannot help knowing that the living standards of an average French worker are higher than those of his comrade in the U.S.S.R."

Is this statement of Comrade Perignon based on the study of the conditions of workers in the U.S.S.R.? Is it not superficial and crude, and therefore wrong, tendentious?

I refute Comrade Perignon's statement and wish to prove this to the minoritarian comrades from France.

First of all we must make more precise the following: what average French worker does Comrade Perignon speak about? He evidently does not speak of a colonial worker, the brutal exploitation of whom allows the raising of the general living standards of the worker of the Metropolis. I will refer to a few examples illustrating the conditions of labour in the French colonies,—founded on French sources. During the thirteen years of the rôle of French imperialism, the population of Equatorial Africa has decreased from 4,950,000 in 1914 to 3,335,00 in 1927, i.e., by 33 per cent.

André Gide writes about the French Congo: "The country is going to the dogs. Miserable poverty due to which all kinds of diseases are spreading is to be felt everywhere. Three-quarters of illnesses from which the natives are suffering (except the epidemics) are caused by undernourishment."

And here is the testimony of the French writer, A. Londres, concerning the construction of a railway from the capital of the French possessions, Brazzaville, to the ocean, — which was carried out by means of the mass destruction of natives, "17,000 dead bodies were needed in order to construct 140 kilometres of the railway."

Comrade Perignon obviously does not speak of these workers, though I think that when a representative of the French proletariat makes a speech at the meeting of the Executive Bureau of the R.I.L.U., he should pay attention to the workers of all the possessions of France.

We, the Soviet trade unions, have achieved in this respect the full liquidation of the cursed inheritance of Tsarism. We make no difference between the Uzbek, Turkmen, Kirghiz workers or the peoples of far Siberia and the native Russian worker. We understand the necessity of a radical improvement of the conditions of the whole proletariat of the whole country, irrespect-

ive of national origin. We achieved the following: the network of sanitary-hygienic, medical, cultural, social institutions, the institutions for the protection of labour, etc., have been extended at present to the remotest districts of our vast country, being set up even in such places in which there existed no notion of such institutions prior to the Revolution (Samoyeds, Tunguacs, and other peoples living in the remotest parts of the Soviet Union).

But Comrade Perignon does not speak about such things.

Comrade Perignon obviously did not think of foreign workers. In the organ of the General Confederation of Labour of the 25th of December, 1930, these "defenders" of the workers' interests, write the following instead of a Christmas gift: "It is necessary that the authorities should assist on a wider scale than in 1926 and 1927—in the visiting of foreign workers."

The Socialist deputy, Chastané, has written in "People" of the 10th January, this year, as follows: "We are certainly internationalists and will remain such, but is it not painful to see how in some localities foreign workers continue to work while the French ones are already suffering from unemployment? We repeat, we do not even think of affecting in some way or other the foreign workers, of course, not, — but ours is quite a natural care to secure daily bread at least for our folks." So when this Socialist talks of "our folks," he has not in view the foreign workers employed in France. When the minoritarian, Perignon, was speaking, had he in view those foreign workers? I think not. This "not" follows from the whole conception of the minoritarian, from the conception of the Socialist reformists who are internationalists only by words. With us here Negroes, Germans, Englishmen—are members of the Moscow and local Soviets. We have elected them. With us all the workers are equal, and while I am characterising the conditions of the workers in the U.S.S.R., I am constantly taking into consideration the foreign workers whom we not only do not ill-treat but for whom we create the conditions of maximum well-being, sharing with them everything we possess.

Comrade Perignon evidently does not speak of the working women of France either, who make 40 per cent. of the French proletariat. It is well known that the wages of this huge army of hired labour in France are still approximately half as small as the wages of men workers.

Comrade Perignon was hardly thinking of the young workers either, for you did not mention them at all in your reports. And the subject of the reports was the question of the "situation and work of the Federations."

Therefore I must declare: your method is absolutely inadmissible for the R.I.L.U., for the staff of the world revolutionary T.U. movement.

But I state that even according to your method, i.e., comparing the conditions of the workers in the U.S.S.R. with those of the workers of the metropolis, with the native French workers, that is, minus foreign workers, women and youth,—your conclusions are wrong, they are based on your not knowing the facts and follow from your political attitude which is in its essence a reformist one.

Comrade Boville has still recognised two lines: in the U.S.S.R. there is a tendency of a constant increase in wages, in France there is a tendency of the decrease in wages. This is right. According to some data at our disposal and which we can deal with in more detail if necessary, the real wages of a worker in the Paris district, the centre of France, have been reduced by 17 per cent. as against the pre-war wages. With us the real wages of the workers increased by 170 per cent. as against the pre-war wages. If we take the average wages,—I take into consideration also the workers of Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan and Eastern Siberia, as well as young workers, working women, foreign workers, etc.—the nominal wages have during the last three years only increased by over 30 per cent., making on the whole 39 roubles 25 copeks in 1928 and 90 roubles 60 copeks in 1931.

This increase was taking place still more rapidly in separate branches of industry; in the coal industry the wages during the last three years increased by over 50 per cent., in black metallurgy by 32 per cent., in railway transport by 40 per cent. Comrade Boville is not present here to-day, but he should be interested in the food workers. From 1925 to 1928 the food workers' wages increased by 42 per cent., and from 1928 to 1931 by 20 per cent. more. And you must bear in mind that the increase in wages took place simultaneously with the introduction with the 7-hour working day and 5-day working week at the enterprises.

Have you such a tempo of the growth of nominal wages? If we compare these figures with the pre-war level we shall see that these are things which it is difficult to compare. For instance, a worker in the food industry used to earn prior to the war 20 roubles on the average, now he gets on the average, 86 roubles 50 copeks. All our industrial workers used to get on the average 25 roubles, and to-day they get 90 roubles 16 copeks. I have figures concerning separate trades, but I shall not quote them here. If the comrades are interested in separate branches of industry—I can acquaint them with these figures.

Comrades, not only the nominal value of the wages is important for a proletarian. His living standards, the real wages, all those commodities which he may actually use—are important for him.

Take, for instance, unemployment. Has it any significance for the conditions of the working class?

I think it has enormous significance, for unemployment leaves a definite part of the workers without the necessary means of existence.

(Lozovsky: And presses on the wages of others.)

Unemployment presses on the wages of others. The fear of unemployment, uncertainty as regards "to-morrow" makes a worker put by some money, if possible, and economise, cutting down even the most necessary expenses. And this should be called the best case. The worst case is that when a worker remains jobless—he simply dies from hunger. We have examined here the data on unemployment in France. According to our materials out of 30,000 towns and villages of France—the municipalities grant benefit to the unemployed only in 200 towns, and this benefit is smaller than the minimum wages even. More than this, the French reformists whom you are praising so much take pains in order to cut the miserable dole granted to the unemployed. The instance of the "theoretician" of the Socialist party, Déat, shows the baseness of these betrayers. Déat writes as follows: "Down with the unemployment insurance, it only brings about the corruption and degradation of the working class, who will get used to receiving money without any labour." And to crown his nastiness, this blackguard adds: "Instead of granting unemployment benefit would not it be better to compensate the manufacturers who were affected by the crisis?"

With us in the Soviet country unemployment does not exist. The increase in the number of people who get wages in the U.S.S.R. is as follows: In 1926, 10,990,000; in 1930 and 1931, 16,010,000. The number of industrial workers employed directly in industry is growing in the following way: In 1926, 3,265,000; in 1930, 7,462,000; in 1931, 8,868,000. We have no unemployed at all. On the contrary, we are confronting the problem of training cadres, of drawing new cadres into industry. In a worker's family there is now not only one worker-wage earner, but the other efficient members of the worker's family are also employed.

We had the possibility to put on a big scale the question of the drawing of women into industry, into all branches of national economy, for we are creating the necessary conditions for the

emancipation of women. So, for instance, in 1917 we had only 14 crèches, and in 1929 we had already 1,433. During the last three years this figure has greatly increased. If we take into consideration the crèches in towns and in villages as well as the seasonal crèches, we shall see that in 1931 we succeeded in embracing 1,590,000 children by crèches.

The maintenance of a child in our crèches is wholly at the expense of the State. Has it any significance for the budget of a worker's family? Does it exercise any influence on the real wages? A toiling woman, as a rule, used to give birth to a child at home, without medical aid. Only well-off people could have medical aid. This year 90 per cent. of our working women in towns had their confinement in hospitals where they, as a rule, have medical treatment free. Has it, comrades, any significance for the real wages of a worker's family?

We have a wide network of maternity homes, consultations for children, where care is taken of the health of a mother and child, advice is given and necessary dietetic foodstuffs distributed. And all this is given gratis. Has it any importance for the worker's budget?

U.S.S.R. is the only country where the toiling women get leaves for eight weeks before and six weeks after confinement, receiving full wages during this period of time. I will not enumerate the privileges the toiling women have in the Soviet Union. I wish to tell Comrade Perignon that it is impossible not to take them into consideration while speaking of the real wages. I ask the comrades to acquaint themselves with our institutions catering for mother and child. (Tormasova: Especially as one of them is in this building.") (Palace of Labour.—Ed.).

Young workers (I speak of persons aged from 15 to 17 years) are completely occupied by studies. The duration of the working day for persons aged from 16 to 18 years, should not, according to the law, exceed six hours. This is the actual working day of the persons aged from 16 to 18. In 1913 they worked 9 hours 45 minutes, in 1929 5 hours 20 minutes and in 1931 4 hours. And these 4 hours are devoted by our youth to study.

I ask the comrades whether the free education of children and grants for the adults have any significance for the budget of a worker's family or not?

Over 1,206,000 persons are studying in 1931 at the factory apprenticeship schools. These are the schools which are attended after the elementary 7-year schools and where the theoretical studies are combined with productive labour. The State has spent in 1931 alone, 300,000,000 roubles on these factory-schools. 364,000 toilers

and their children study at our schools and universities, and the majority of them get grants. 715,000 toilers and their children are studying at the technicums. And if you bear in mind that the workers and peasants who study at the universities of the U.S.S.R. are, as a rule, given grants amounting approximately to the average wages of an industrial worker, and have all the other privileges and advantages (in the department of municipal, sanatorium, medical and similar privileges) the same as the workers employed in industry,—you will understand the rôle of the school in the cause of the improvement of the conditions of the working class. Do these figures show that the workers of the Soviet country have fewer opportunities for the satisfaction of their requirements, than the French workers? How many hundred thousand workers study at the universities and institutes of France? Or perhaps the French workers do not wish to become engineers or physicians? We have created a new type of a higher school, a factory higher technical school, a school-factory. We have got such factories, such works, where all the workers without any exception are occupied by studies, where a worker may become an engineer without leaving his job. Has it any significance, comrades, for the characterisation of the conditions of the working class in the U.S.S.R.?

We have many adult workers who were unable to finish their studies at the middle schools, but who want to study, whose thirst for knowledge is great. We set up workers' faculties, which prepare these workers for entering universities. This year 331,000 toilers are studying at the workers' faculties, they all get grants, are provided with flats and food on the part of the State.

Further, as regards the liquidation of illiteracy, I think that we shall soon surpass France. According to the data at my disposal, France occupies fourteenth place amongst other countries as regards literacy; there are nine illiterate soldiers in a hundred. These are data for 1924. Where, then, are your bourgeois illiterate? These have been the illiterate toilers. And in Russia we have the following figures. The calculation is also made on a hundred. And I shall take, not soldiers, but everybody aged from ten to very old men and women; out of 100 persons in 1920, 32 were literate, in 1926, 40, and in 1931, 70 in a 100 were literate. These are the big strides we take. This year we have already 70 per cent. of literate people, counting from children aged 10, including Kurghises, Turkmens, Usbeks and other peoples who had no literacy at all prior to the Revolution.

In France the number of children embraced by the elementary school decreased by 3.1 per cent.,

and we have introduced this year compulsory elementary education all over the country. The growth of the contingent of pupils is as follows: In 1914-15, 7,800,000 children studied at the elementary and middle schools; last year, 14,000,000, and this year, if we add the apprentices-adolescents, 20,000,000 are studying. What do these figures prove? These figures, comrades, tell that we shall very soon have no illiterate persons, and with you the percentage of pupils is decreasing and illiteracy growing all over the country. And we succeeded in achieving the provision of the children in the overwhelming majority of schools with hot lunches and the poorest children get footgear and clothes.

Finally, has it any significance for the real wages of a worker that in a country with a population of 160,000,000 nearly 70,000,000 persons study at all kinds of schools and universities? Can we say now, as Comrade Perignon said, that the Russian workers require less than the French ones?

Let us take the questions of social insurance. The Soviet social insurance is extended to all toilers without any exception, and irrespective of the character of work and the duration of this work. In 1913, during Tzarism, only one-sixth part of the workers were insured, and that only partially, against sickness. In 1927, 16,000,000 were insured, in 1930, 13,600,000, and in 1931, 16,030,000. Social insurance is carried out at the expense of the State and the employers, without any deductions from the workers' wages. The budget of social insurance in the Soviet Union amounted to 474,000,000 in 1925, 2,173,000 in 1931, and will be not less than three milliard roubles in 1932. These funds are at the disposal of the insurance committees, elected by trade union congresses, i.e., they are at the disposal of the workers themselves. And our social insurance is the fullest of all existing at present as regards its dimensions. An insured worker gets his full wages in case of sickness, from the first day of illness till his full recovery, or until he is passed over to an institution. A worker receives medical aid free, as well as free medicines. An insured woman worker, as well as wife of an insured worker, gets benefit for suckling her baby until it is nine months old, and also things necessary for the care of a newborn baby. If we take all kinds of State financial support for the improvement of the social and cultural conditions of the workers in the U.S.S.R. (social insurance, deduction from profit, free municipal service, housing, education, protection of health, public nourishment), then during two years (1929 and 1930) the respective State funds for workers and employees increased from 3,372 million to 6,571

million roubles. In 1931 these funds will amount to 9,969 million roubles. I will note only the work of our health resorts and rest homes. We confiscated the palaces of the Tzars, the magnates of capital and of the aristocracy. In these palaces we organised health resorts and sanatoria for the workers and peasants. This year over 900,000 toilers will be sent to these sanatoria and health resorts; 124 persons in each thousand of metal workers were in the sanatoria and health resorts during this year alone, 135 in each thousand of miners, 108 in each thousand of chemical workers, 114 in each thousand of transport workers, Comrade Rambaud. These people live in the sanatoria, health resorts and the rest homes, getting during their holidays full wages, food at the expense of the State, and passage at the expense of the insurance organs. Our workers have dietetic nourishment, milk kitchen, special night sanatoria, where the workers come after work, and so on, and so forth.

I ask you, comrades, have over two milliard roubles of social insurance, which are at the disposal of the committees elected by the trade unions, any significance for the real wages of the workers, or not?

We have the seven-hour working day; 92 per cent. of all workers will have the seven-hour working day this year. We spent 240,000,000 roubles on the protection of labour. We will spend this year over a milliard roubles on the workers' housing, etc., etc. Thanks to all this, the children's death rate became twice as small as compared with the pre-war time, and the death rate of adult persons decreased by 36 per cent. Is this an indication of the improvement of the conditions of the working class or not? Each year 3½ million of new bolsheviks are born in our country. (Laughter.)

The population increases by 3½ million each year. And how many will it make in five years, comrades? In five years it will make one-third of the population of France. (Laughter.) I could name other figures, too. We have over 4,000 workers' clubs belonging to the trade unions. Many of these clubs are huge palaces. We have 92,000 branches of the clubs, Red Corners, as we call them, a network of libraries, a huge network of physical culture institutions, etc., etc.

We have the widest network of the workers' press in the world, beginning from central editions and ending with factory newspapers; we have a two million army of worker-correspondents, etc.

But if we take all this into consideration, how will it be possible to make the conclusion of the better conditions of French workers? Public

relief, absence of unemployment, social insurance, teaching of children and of workers themselves, free medical aid, sanatoria and health resorts, special maternity homes, etc.—all this created those pre-requisites for the grandiose competition on the front of socialist construction, in consequence of which the “Electrozavod,” which you visited, as well as a number of other factories and works, executed the Five-Year Plan in $2\frac{1}{2}$ years, *and so we will execute the Five-Year Plan on the whole in four years.*

Comrades, speaking about the conditions of the working class, I think it is necessary first of all to take into consideration the political régime. In the country of the dictatorship of the proletariat, where the theatres, palaces, libraries, museums, everything which our country possesses, is in the hands of the working class, such a fact should be taken into consideration. It is impossible, while estimating the conditions of the working class, to pay no attention to such a fact as the dictatorship of the bourgeois or the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Is it possible to forget, when comparing the living standards and conditions of labour of a French worker and of a Soviet worker, that fundamental decisive fact that in the Soviet Union the State power is in the hands of the working class, while the French State is a weapon of imperialist robbery, a weapon of struggle against the workers, and of suppression of the labour movement. The Soviets are a powerful force in the hands of the proletariat and peasantry, who are successfully creating a new society, the socialist society, in which, as Marx said, there will be no exploitation of man by man, there will be no classes. Do you think, comrades minorities, that the Russian revolution could win a victory and not be suppressed in floods of blood, as your “peaceful” imperialist France has eagerly wished this; could secure the existing standards of the material and cultural welfare of the toilers and create all the necessary conditions for the really gigantic prospects on this field—without the powerful force of the Soviets, without the apparatus of the workers’ State?

The Soviets are not a screen for the fooling of the masses, like the French representative organs. The Soviets are not the organs of French parliamentary chatter, under the cover of which the imperialist bosses carry out the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. No; the Soviets are full-blooded, sovereign organs of the proletariat and peasantry, securing the actual participation of each toiler in the administering of State power. The Soviets are not a play at democracy. Soviet democracy is the most progressive democracy in the world, for it is the democracy of the for-

merly exploited majority — the workers and peasants. The Soviets are the school of the political growth of toilers, which can be compared to nothing else in the world. If you had attended, say, the last Sixth All-Union Congress of the Soviets, you would have been convinced of the enormous political growth of the rank and file workers or peasants. You would have seen on the tribune of this supreme organ of proletarian power not the parliamentary rascals, professional politicians of France, but 100 per cent. workers from the bench, peasants who have left their ploughs and tractors to come to the Congress, the representatives of peoples living in the remotest parts of the U.S.S.R. You would have been surprised at the wisdom of State outlook, with the profound understanding of general State affairs, and with the broad prospects characterising the speeches of those who were but recently miserable and oppressed by the machine of the Tzarist, bourgeois State. You would have understood then the grandeur of the proletarian dictatorship, its inexhaustible resources, its invincible power.

The Soviets are an organisation which does not hinder and is not afraid of the development of the proletarian self-criticism of the mass activity of the working class and of social organisations, as the defenders of bourgeois democracy, the reformists, including the syndicalist leaders, are slandering about this. On the contrary, the Soviet system presupposes, according to its class essence, the development of proletarian publicity, the development of proletarian democracy and self-criticism. Tell me of another State in which the organs of State power would have been under the constant effective control of the factories and works, in which the factories and works would take over patronage of the organs of power, as is the case here, daily check their work, actually participate in determining the policy of these organs of power and influence the composition of these organs, etc. Nothing like this exists in the world, because such things can take place only in the country in which the proletariat is ruling.

And if we still suffer from a number of shortcomings, if we still need many things, and are imperfect in many respects, the cause of this is not the lack of democracy in our country, not the impossibility to radically improve and influence the State apparatus, but the absence of sufficient flexibility, culture and ability to utilise the richest opportunities present in the Soviet system, in the socialist system of managing economy, in the system of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In a word, the Soviet State secures by means of its apparatus, its colossal resources and power,

the true realisation of the requirements and demands of the workers' activity, and thus stimulates the further progress of proletarian democracy.

Yes, we have the right to pride ourselves upon our State, upon our government, which is the stablest in the world, upon the Soviets which have become the greatest factor of international proletarian revolution.

And what about the proletariat being sure of the morrow? The proletariat of the U.S.S.R. know that they work for themselves, that each day and hour of their work improves their conditions and that in five years their living standards will be much higher than to-day. This fact also cannot be ignored. This causes courage, sureness, this creates the possibility of cultural flourishing, political activity, and this enables the proletariat to further its great cause which calls forth the admiration of even such inveterate bourgeois and aristocrats as Lord and Lady Astor.

We do not deny that we have quite a number of difficulties, and of very great difficulties. We have never tried to prove that our workers are already living in paradise. But you would have the right to reproach us only on the following conditions: (1) If these were difficulties of a degrading order, difficulties of a system regressing politically, economically and culturally, difficulties which we were concealing, and (2) If we were not struggling against those difficulties, and if they were not decreasing. But there is no need to prove to you that you have got neither the first nor the second ground for a charge against us, and will never get it. We are experiencing the difficulties of growth, despite capitalism which is fatally stricken with the sickness of a decline. Is not the fact of the U.S.S.R. developing at a tremendous rate at the moment when the capitalist world is affected by the most severe industrial, agricultural and financial crises growing into a political crisis, the best proof of this? Further, we are vigorously and with ever-growing resource overcoming these maladies, inevitable in a growing organism, these difficulties of growth. Only a hopeless idiot could think that the October revolution would be able to liquidate at one stroke the centuries-old backwardness of Russia and in the course of the struggle against the intervention of capitalist powers which destroyed priceless values in our country—achieve at once an earthly paradise. Neither absolutely naive people or our enemies can make such claims to us.

You, who lay claim to the honorary title of the representatives of French workers should understand that our difficulties proceed from the conditions of class struggle.

We are carrying out our great cause under the conditions of desperate resistance on the part of all the class enemies of the proletariat, the world bourgeoisie and its hirelings, who are constantly putting spokes in the wheels of socialist construction.

This is in short why I object most sharply to Comrade Perignon's statement supported by Boville, as regards the advantages of the conditions of the French workers over those of the Soviet workers. And I ask, Comrade Perignon, if you study the figures, if you acquaint yourself a little better with our country, and throw off any prejudice, will you still maintain in France that a French worker lives better than a worker lives in the U.S.S.R.

And if Comrade Perignon ventures, after all this, to insist on his statement, I must categorically declare that the representatives of the minorities, who boast of their contact with the workers—take into consideration the interest not of an average French worker, not the interests and living conditions of the working class in France, but the living conditions of the workers' "aristocracy," corrupted by the bourgeoisie. In such case, he, Perignon, proceeds from the conditions of those whose caste interests are represented to the detriment of the interests of the French proletariat—by the betrayers of the working class—the reformists of all shades. But, Comrade Perignon, the Soviet proletarians who have no relationship with the French reformists—would not listen to a comparison with such elements.

And what is the political meaning of Perignon and Boville's statements? Does it mean that the French proletariat is out of the way of the revolution? It is clear to everybody that the bourgeoisie would comment precisely like the above-mentioned statement, and reformism would commend these statements as the evidence of the minorities to the conditions of the workers in the Soviet Union,—if such statements as Perignon made here were published in France.

Comrades, is it true that the laws of revolution are not similar for all countries, that such a revolution which was made by the Russian workers is impossible in France? We take into consideration the necessity of flexible tactics, but we state that a revolutionary should not only speak of those particularities but should also speak of the basic laws of revolution. The laws of revolution act with inexorable force, for such is the nature of class struggle. Nobody, even Boville (laughter) can stop the wheel of history. The proletarian revolution will win a victory in France as well,—with you or against you. It is you who should make a turn and not the R.I.L.U. It depends on you, with whom are you—whether

you will win a victory together with the revolutionary masses in France, or the rise of the revolutionary wave will sweep you away. For a revolutionary, for a worker in the revolutionary

T.U. movement, there can be no higher task than that of preparing the workers everywhere and under any conditions for the future victory of the proletariat all over the world. (Applause.)

THE STRUGGLE FOR INDIAN STATE INDEPENDENCE A CONDITION OF SUCCESS OF THE ENGLISH PROLETARIAT

By VALIA

THE present situation and the lessons of the last election in England make it necessary once more to consider the Indian problem in the light of its significance for the struggle for proletarian dictatorship in England.

The English proletariat has been trained for several decades in the spirit of liberalism, of the invincibility of the British Empire and the traditions connected with it, of the infallibility of British "democracy" and the stability of wages, the concessions gained by the proletariat.

The aristocracy of labour, which grew out of the super-profit of British imperialism, energetically assisted in enforcing these "imperialist" traditions among the broad masses of workers. The relative increase in wages, and later the growing number of votes and additional seats for the Labour Party in Parliament, only helped to consolidate the liberal traditions and illusions spread by the reformists among the working class, and to increase their belief that the whole development of England gradually leads to the ever-increasing welfare of the workers and the final peaceful transition to "socialism."

Despite the fact that in the post-war period the English bourgeoisie led an attack upon various sections of the working class, and the army of unemployed became a permanent feature, the bourgeoisie was able during the first years that followed the war to grant insignificant concessions (social insurance and so on), "concessions which certainly delay the revolutionary movement . . . and create something in the nature of 'social peace'." (Lenin.)

On the basis of these concessions and the development of new branches of industry (chemical and others) the influence of the labour aristocracy has grown, especially the influence of those sections of bureaucracy which are directly connected with the bourgeois apparatus in all its forms. Mondism and the Labour Government, which represents this ideology in State form, has grown up on this basis.

In recent years the position has changed radically: British imperialism is not only no longer in a position to grant separate, insignificant con-

cessions, but is compelled to take back those which the working class forced it to grant in previous years; the standard of living of the English proletariat has begun to fall *absolutely*. This trend of development is a devastating blow to all the prevailing ideas of the English proletariat. That which he was accustomed to look upon as stable and secure—the sacredness of his penny—has now become unstable.

Faith in the parliamentary road of "development" is beginning to waver, and if perhaps it is not true at the present moment to state that the parliamentary system is already discredited in the eyes of the majority of the proletariat, there is not the slightest doubt that the experience of the Labour Party has shown to a considerable section of the working class the bourgeois anti-proletarian character of Parliament and the danger, the falsity of all illusions connected with it.

The crisis which is growing inside the British Empire has hastened the open transition of part of the privileged upper strata of the proletariat to the side of the Conservative Party and has also increased the rate at which the broad masses of workers are becoming radicalised. This two-sided development did not begin with the fall of the Labour Government. It made itself manifest in a wave of spontaneous strikes, which took place in spite of, and to some extent even against, the trade union leadership in 1930 and 1931. It could be seen in the wave of spontaneous mass demonstrations and, finally, in the elections themselves.

The crisis which has begun in the British Empire raises all the questions facing the workers in a different way. One might say that all values have now *begun* to be re-estimated, and the process is going on. The Labour Party taught the English proletariat that English development should go forward along the lines of the denial of the class struggle and the conversion of the British Empire into "a family of friendly peoples" under the protection of Great Britain. The working class is now discovering on the experience of class struggle that there is not and

cannot be class peace. A broad basis is being *created* for the growth of the Communist Party and the destruction of all liberal-imperialist traditions among the English proletariat.

There is a revaluation of ideas in England; there is a rearrangement of class forces. The English bourgeoisie is trying to use the unstable situation, the search of the toiling masses for new ways of development and struggle, for its own purposes; for this reason it has launched its programme for a way out of the crisis: (1) protectionism, (2) consolidation of the British Empire and the introduction of a system of preferential tariffs inside the Empire, (3) economies and sacrifices by the toilers in the interests of the "nation." This, of course, in actual fact means increased exploitation and terror against the workers and colonial peoples, tariff warfare and, finally, war against the U.S.S.R. and a new division of the world.

The British bourgeoisie rapidly manœuvres to put this programme through Parliament and draws over to its side both the petty bourgeoisie and the labour aristocracy. And, of course, it will not hesitate to put through its aims by means of open fascist dictatorship, should all other means fail.

The Conservative bourgeoisie does its best to make its programme palatable with promises to "maintain" the present wages level, and safeguard savings, etc., and by holding out hopes of a new era of industrial boom and the end of unemployment. The British Empire safeguarded by tariffs and with the help of temporary sacrifices will go forward to the new stage of prosperity—this is the way out advocated by the Conservatives and supported by the Liberals and Labourites.

The elections clearly show that in order to organise the resistance of the proletariat, to smash the opportunists and finish with illusions, there must be a proletarian programme for a revolutionary way out of the crisis to sharply oppose the bourgeois programme of "saving" the British Empire, and that around this proletarian programme and in connection with it there must be waged a day-to-day struggle for "not a penny off," for the partial demands of the proletariat.

* * *

"English reaction in England is rooted in the enslavement of Ireland," wrote Marx. Now we can say that "English reaction in England" has its roots mainly in the enslavement of India. The enslavement of India and the spreading of the Great Power, imperialist traditions and opinions among the English proletariat is the corner-stone of the British Empire. Destroy this stone and

the whole capitalist system in England will fall to the ground.

One of the most important tasks of the English Communist Party is to estimate correctly and explain properly to the broad masses of the proletariat the essence of the Indian problem.

The backward sections of the English working class are still led by the nose by the Conservative bourgeoisie who declare that the loss of India would mean the downfall, the degradation and degeneration of the toiling masses of England. Imperialist traditions are still so strong in the ranks of the English proletariat that many class-conscious workers and Communist Party supporters consider that the demand for Indian independence isolates the English Communist Party from the working class masses. Actually this amounts to the fact that the Communist Party raises this question of Indian State independence in a very weak way and does not explain the meaning of the Indian revolution for the victory of the English proletariat. It is this weakness of our Party which the Conservative bourgeoisie makes use of when they energetically try to cultivate reactionary, imperialist feelings current among the backward sections of the working class and, in this way, reinforce their domination over the proletariat as a whole in order to safeguard the capitalist system. As long as the English proletariat, willingly or unwillingly, supports the bourgeoisie in exploiting India and the other colonies, it will be compelled to support the capitalist system in England and thus *remain* in the position of slaves, relentlessly exploited by capitalism. It was in this sense that Marx said that there can be no free nation that oppresses other peoples. And there is no way out of this except that which has been constantly shown by the Comintern since its inception and confirmed by the experience of the U.S.S.R.; the constant day-to-day support of the struggle of all oppressed nations for their complete independence.

At the parliamentary elections the English Young Communists came out with a platform which said nothing at all about India. The election address of the Communist Party unfortunately substituted the clearly-defined demand for complete State independence of India by the slogan of emancipation of India, and even this took the form of a nebulous statement to the effect that an emancipated Socialist England would mean emancipated India.

The English Young Communists made a *serious* mistake, the roots of which can be found not so much in the subjective attitude of the Central Committee of the Young Communist League as in the insufficient understanding and

underestimation of the Indian problem which is spread throughout the ranks of the Communist Party itself.

* * *

The English proletariat fears hunger, and that the isolation of England would bring about a further drop in their standard of living. The bourgeoisie is constantly making this assertion and does its utmost to train the proletariat in the spirit of loyalty to the interests of the usurious British Empire. The whole programme of the National bloc is built upon this. The Communist Party will be able to overcome this attitude of the backward workers and free them from the influence of the bourgeoisie and its agents in the labour movement only when it ceases to remain silent on "national" questions and, having launched the most energetic campaign, will offer its own programme in sharp, clear opposition to that of the bourgeoisie. This programme must fight for an independent workers' and peasants' India and for a Soviet England.

Is it possible for England to maintain or, rather, to restore its position as one of the world's workshops under the capitalist system? No, it is not possible. The whole history of the last few years testifies to this. All the centrifugal tendencies in the dominions and the growing intensity of class struggle and the revolutionary movement in the colonies prove this. The uneven development of capitalism, which has led to the situation where England is more and more compelled to give way on the world market, points to this.

British imperialism hopes, under cover of protectionism and the monopoly of State power in its colonial possessions, to put its house in order and scrape out of the crisis. In this connection it will be cruelly disappointed, for protectionism cannot save it, either from the competition of more powerful countries, the increase of the class struggle of the proletariat, or from the growing resistance in the colonies. Under capitalism there is no way out for England. A continuation of the capitalist system means further downfall, the impoverishment of the proletariat, increased exploitation, the development of fascism and warfare, including war in the colonies.

The only way out of the crisis which will lead to the restoration of England and its return to the position of one of the world's industrial workshops can be found only as a result of the proletarian revolution and the institution of a system of Socialist, Soviet republics, co-operating among themselves and planning world economy on the basis of the estimate of all economic conditions and in the interests of the toiling masses of the

world. Thus only the revolutionary proletariat and its programme for a way out of the crisis truly represents the interests of the broad masses of the English population.

The reactionary nature of British imperialism can be seen from the results of its policy in India. Some Liberals write that in the interests of English industry and trade all measures should be taken to raise the purchasing power of the Indian market, to improve the position of the Indian peasants, and in general to help the "development" of productive forces and destroy all feudal survivals. And yet in India just the opposite occurs. British imperialism has led to a state of affairs where the national income per capita of the population is equal approximately to two pounds sterling annually, and where agriculture is in total degradation: for instance, the yield of rice per acre of land is equal to 8½ cwts., whereas in Japan it is equal to 21-22 cwts.; the yield of cotton is one-third of that in the United States, and so on.

The peasants are strangled by the yoke of the moneylender, the landlord and the native prince, who are supported by British imperialism and the Indian capitalists. The survivals of the caste system and feudalism, illiteracy, disease, religious enmity, etc., all this is intensified by British imperialism and is a result of its domination. The Indian people are suffocated by slavery, poverty and famine—and not only do the Indian workers and peasants suffer as a result of this, but *the workers of England and other industrially advanced countries suffer as well.*

Thus, to take the direct result of the domination and policy of British imperialism in the colonies, every worker in England will readily understand, especially if it is explained to him in facts, that the existence of the capitalist system in England not only fails to improve the erstwhile favourable material position of the workers of England, or even to maintain that level, but, *on the contrary*, leads to the impoverishment and degradation not only of the toilers of India, but also of the workers of England. The maintenance of the capitalist system and the exploiting system known as the "British Empire" will signify the *enslavement* of the English proletariat combined with the *constant worsening* of their material and legal position.

The programme of the Conservative bourgeoisie means starvation to the broad masses of the proletariat. The only way out is to *destroy* capitalism in England, to give assistance to the heroic struggle of the population of India for national and social liberation, and to create the conditions in India for the free development of the land

under the leadership of the Indian proletariat. Only on these lines can true co-operation grow up between England and India and new prosperity begin, a new era of life in both countries, which together with other Soviet countries will guarantee unprecedented progress and the development of both nations and the whole of mankind.

The line which the English Communist Party must take up is the struggle for Soviet England and an independent workers' and peasants' India, which will guarantee the voluntary alliance and collaboration of both countries with all other Soviet countries. The correctness of this plan is confirmed by the whole trend of development of the class struggle in England and India, and is shown by the experience of the Soviet Union.

Russia was previously the "people's gaol," many of whose nationalities were in a position of colonial enslavement. The proletarian revolution converted this "people's gaol" into a free, voluntary, fraternal alliance of equal independent Soviet republics, all of which are struggling to build up the Socialist system. The basis of this voluntary, militant unity is the Soviet system, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and the guidance of the Communist Party. The Bolshevik solution to the national question which guarantees independence and free development for all nations dwelling upon the territory of old Tsarist Russia has created true mutual confidence and voluntary unity of purpose among the toiling masses of all these republics in the struggle for Socialism, for the defence of the U.S.S.R. from the onslaught of world imperialism.

Inside the Soviet Union the Bolshevik policy of the Communist Party ensured not only the cultural growth of the backward national States, but also brought about an enormous, universal, development of productive forces; moreover, several of these republics are being converted into first-class industrial republics. This growth in its turn has brought about an enormous development of the productive forces of the whole Soviet Union, which again has opened up the possibility of a constant rise in the material welfare of the whole population.

Thus Soviet practice confirms the correctness of the policy of the Communist International, which, in fighting for the right to self-determination of nations to the extent of separation from the metropolis, declares that the emancipated workers, and the peasant masses led by them, in their fight for Socialism, will find forms of co-operating and collaborating for the struggle against imperialism and for ensuring the fraternal, universal reconstruction of the world on a new Socialist basis.

Having won its independence, the workers' and peasants' Soviet Government of India will, of a surety, enter into collaboration with all the Soviet republics, including Soviet England; the programme of the Indian Communist Party and the activities, demonstrations, etc., of the Indian workers are proof enough of this.

The correct solution to the national question in Russia brought about increased friendship and collaboration among all the separate republics, on the basis of the Soviet Government and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Communist Party of England must convince the English workers to follow the example of Russia and fight for the complete State independence of India. *This is the only road which will safeguard and strengthen co-operation, between the workers' and peasants' Soviet India and Soviet England, built on the basis of the struggle for Socialism throughout the world.* This includes also economic co-operation between these two countries. The toiling masses of India have commenced the struggle for their emancipation. The Indian proletariat is building its Communist Party, and fights for the hegemony in the general people's movement. History will show in which country the revolution will more quickly smash imperialism. In India (which is more likely) or in England. The task consists in mobilising all forces for the struggle in both countries. The victory in either would rapidly spread to the other.

The support given by the English proletariat to the Indian revolution cannot merely take the form of expressions of solidarity and sympathy towards the oppressed Indian proletariat. The protest of the English workers against the terror waged against the toiling masses of India is only an elementary duty, like the condemnation by class-conscious workers of any strikebreaker in any strike.

The support given by the English proletariat to the Indian revolution means direct struggle of the British workers for the overthrow of the capitalist system at home—in England—and for the creation of a Soviet Socialist republic. This is the crux of the question.

The might of the English bourgeoisie lies in its colonial domination. From the super-exploitation of the colonial peoples the English bourgeoisie gave the crumbs and bribed the aristocracy of labour; participation in the colonial apparatus of oppression was the prize with which it bought over considerable sections of the petty bourgeoisie, etc. Under cover of the gospel of the "civilising" rôle of the white races, the

English bourgeoisie is corrupting the proletariat, and, as a result, the toiling masses, in supporting the British colonial empire, at the same time "consolidate" the capitalist system in England, i.e., they tighten the noose of capitalist exploitation and slavery *around their own necks*.

Therefore the overthrow of the bourgeois system in England must be indissolubly connected with the most relentless struggle on the part of the proletariat against the domination of the English bourgeoisie in India. *The overthrow of imperialist domination and the independence of India will aim a mortal blow at the capitalist system in England.*

It is therefore quite obvious why the struggle for Indian independence means the most direct struggle for the institution of the Socialist system in England. The slogan of "Indian State independence" therefore expresses the *most direct vital* interests of the English workers. The strength of the Conservatives lies in the circumstance that they, together with the Labourites, are making use of the fact that the Communist Party is neither clear in the way it fights for Indian independence, nor fights sufficiently extensively or constantly, and that the Communist Party fails to make this struggle part of the day-to-day fight of the workers; and the Conservatives, together with the Labourites, are now striving to strengthen their influence among the working class and to isolate the Communist Party, by playing upon the "imperialist" traditions of the backward sections of the proletariat. This is going on at a time when the *strength* of our party depends exactly upon the extent to which we are able to raise the question of State independence for India in a *clear-cut, explicit* form. If our Communist Party will carry on extensive agitation and explain clearly the meaning of the slogan of Indian independence, it will increase its influence a thousand-fold and muster the broad masses of the proletariat around its banner; whereas if we remain silent on this question or raise it in a "timid" fashion, it will objectively only tend to bring grist to the mill of the Conservatives and result in the isolation of the Communist Party.

The slogan of "complete State independence for India" is the most important strategic slogan of the day not only for England, but for the whole world proletariat in its struggle to overthrow the capitalist system throughout the world.

The colonial theses of the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1921 mentioned that it was the duty of Communist parties of imperialist countries to help *in deed* the oppressed nations of the world and to fight for their emancipation. To express sympathy in words towards

the colonies, and to wage no practical warfare in deed, to offer no assistance to the colonial peoples, is a form of the worst kind of opportunism and a sign of the influence of the Second International, which has been sharply condemned and branded in all the decisions of the Comintern.

There is yet another side to this question. As a result of the national oppression of the toiling masses in the colonies, they have become imbued with a spirit of hatred and suspicion towards not only the white people in general, but also to some extent to the workers of "white" nations, to the workers of the metropolis. This justifiable lack of confidence is made use of by the national bourgeoisie and the imperialists in order to split the united front of the oppressed nations and the world proletariat. Moreover, it is used by the national bourgeoisie under cover of phrases about "national unity" to subject the workers of their own colonial country to their own influence, and thus isolate them from the world Communist movement.

Thus, the very fact that the Communists of imperialist countries frequently fail to carry on practical work for the independence of colonial nations, not only fortifies the capitalist régime at home, but also consolidates the position of the treacherous national bourgeoisie in the colonies.

In order to overcome this situation and to gain the confidence, friendship and alliance of the toiling masses of the colonies, the working class, and especially the Communist Party in the metropolis, *must wage a constant, systematic struggle for the independence of the colonial peoples*, and prove *in actual deed* their determination to fight to the death for the independence of the colonies.

In this connection attention should be paid to unmasking the so-called "civilising" rôle of the metropolis in the colonies and the propaganda carried on by the bourgeoisie to the effect that "white" peoples are higher than all others in intellectual and other respects.

The lying nature of the gospel of the "civilising" rôle of the white races is clear from thousands of concrete facts which depict the poverty, degradation, exploitation which reigns in the colonies as a result of the rule of "civilised" exploiters and which, in their turn, lead to the impoverishment of the toiling masses in the metropolis.

The fable about the "higher" rôle of the white races who are called upon to enlighten the "savage" peoples is being spread, incidentally, by the Japanese (true, yellow-skinned) imperialism among their own workers, in speaking about their civilising rôle in China, Manchuria and Korea.

The practical activities of the Communist Party, therefore, must also include the most

energetic struggle against all prejudices of this kind which are to be found among the backward sections of the English proletariat.

The Labour Party entirely supports the English bourgeoisie and side by side with the latter operates a policy which enslaves and exploits the Indian people. The Labour Party, together with the so-called Independent Labour Party, and equally with the Conservatives, is trying to maintain the feudal-landlord system of the native princes, landlords and moneylenders in India. Together with the Conservatives the Labour Party is responsible for the caste survivals, and the Hindu-Moslim strife; together they are trying to suppress the Indian revolution and come to an agreement with the native exploiters.

The "Round Table" Conference, staged by the English bourgeoisie jointly with the Labour Party, aims at mustering together all the forces of reaction against the rising tide of the workers' and peasants' revolution in India. All the bartering for concessions which is taking place between the imperialists and the Indian bourgeoisie is simply haggling over the share of profits which each is to gain by their joint exploitation of the Indian people.

The "Round Table" Conference is directed not only against the Indian revolution, it is directed *also* against the English proletariat. For the concentration of forces against the Indian revolution *is at the same time* the concentration of forces against the English proletariat, *preparation for the further increase of enslavement and exploitation of the workers of Great Britain.*

The most essential, urgent task of the moment is to unmask the imperialist policy of the Labour Party and the General Council of Trade Unions. The Labour Party during its term of office waged constant terror in the colonies and sent military expeditions (Burma, North-West Frontier Province, etc.), to enslave the Indian people, and during 1930, hurled over 50,000 Indians into gaol. Thousands shot, millions dead from famine, etc.—these are examples of the activities of the Labour Party. The Labour Party added to its policy of enslavement other measures (following the example of the British bourgeoisie) directed towards forming its own agency of British imperialism inside the Indian labour movement: for instance the Joshi, Shiva-Rao, Giri, Chaman-Lal group and others from the so-called Trade Union Federation.

The most active rôle in operating this policy was carried on, and is still being carried on by

the Independent Labour Party, under cover of "radical" phrases; and now by means of its alleged "independence" it is not only trying to fool and disorganise the English workers, but, in declaring in words its sympathy for the Indian people and their right to national self-determination, it is trying to help disorganise the Indian revolutionary movement. The Independent Labour Party, in wholeheartedly supporting the Labour Government, sought to assist in the creation of left-reformist, pseudo-Socialist, anti-revolutionary organisations in India like the Punjab Socialist Party. With its half-hearted support of Nehru, Gandhi, Roy and other national reformists, it sought to help amalgamate the national-reformists with the Joshi-Giri group into a reactionary bloc inside the trade union movement against the revolutionary proletariat. The Independent Labour Party is trying to disorganise *from inside* and to smash the revolutionary struggle of the toiling masses of India.

The rôle of the "left" opposition which the Independent Labour Party is trying to play in England at present has been assumed not only to disorganise the revolutionary struggle of the English proletariat and to isolate the Communist Party, but also to help the national-reformists to disorganise the Indian proletariat.

An integral part of the general struggle of the Communist Party of England for winning the *majority* of the English proletariat and for overthrowing the capitalist system is to fight against and unmask the Labour Party and the Independent Labour Party.

There can be unity between the English proletariat and India only along the lines advocated by the Communist Party, i.e., along the lines of unity with the revolutionary proletariat of India in the struggle against the landlord-bourgeois bloc (and the National Congress). Therefore it is the duty of the English proletariat and its vanguard, the Communist Party, to help isolate the Indian bourgeoisie and its organ, the National Congress, and to bring about the hegemony of the proletariat in the liberation movement of the Indian people.

All that has been written above goes to prove why the platform of action of the Communist Party of India expresses not only the interests of India, but of the English proletariat as well and is one of the fundamental documents upon the basis of which the Communist movement in England will be able to consolidate its ranks, develop and win power.

THE NATIONAL QUESTION IN CAPITALIST EUROPE

(From Comrade Kuusinen's report at the session of the Presidium of the E.C.C.I.)

(Continued from No. 17, page 543.)

BUT, notwithstanding the difference mentioned above, it is perfectly obvious that it is impossible to approach the question of revolution in the ruling nation or the subject nation it oppresses in isolation one from the other. The State power is the power of the *same* State throughout Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Yugo-Slavia, Roumania, etc. In each case the bourgeoisie and landlords of the ruling nation are the chief enemies of national freedom for the subject nation just as they are of the class struggle of the revolutionary country in the whole land, and the bourgeoisie of the subject nation forms a united front all the time with the bourgeoisie and landlords of the ruling country in the struggle against the revolution. The chief motive force of the revolution is also the same throughout the whole State, i.e., the revolutionary proletariat of the various nations. Again there is only one Communist Party. Accordingly it would be quite incorrect to approach this question in such a manner that there would be talk of "two revolutions": in each of the States under review there is one revolution and one counter-revolution.

But it is necessary to make concrete a definition of the character of this revolution, to estimate the uniqueness of the Polish revolution, appreciating in this case especially its connection with the national question. I do not consider it altogether a correct definition to call the coming revolution in Poland socialist, without any supplementary explanation. In my opinion it would be better to talk of a *Soviet* revolution in Poland, while explaining that in our estimation, in Poland proper, to begin with this revolution will have to a preponderating degree the character of a proletarian revolution, though it is true it will have "a large proportion of problems of a bourgeois-democratic character," while in Western Ukraine and Western White Russia, at the beginning of this revolution, problems of a bourgeois-democratic character will predominate, though it will develop comparatively quickly into a socialist revolution. Elucidating the question in this manner, it is easy to avoid a definition of the socialist revolution apparently *opposed* to that of a Soviet revolution.

Of course it is not possible to apply the definition of the Polish revolution without modification to, let us say, the Balkan countries. In these, it is obvious that there is no foundation for making such an essential difference of approach as in Poland to the question of the character of the revolution in the different national areas. It is possible, that as the result of a concrete study of the question, it will seem correct for every (or almost every) one of the Balkan lands to define the character of the revolution as a

bourgeois-democratic revolution. But, in this case, there is a considerable difference beyond doubt in the fundamental tasks of the first stage of the revolution in the territories of the ruling country and in that of the different national areas notwithstanding the nearly identical general character of the revolution. The relics of feudalism in agrarian relations are e.g. in Croatia in comparison with Serbia, much stronger than the preponderance of such relics in Western Ukraine over Poland proper, in spite of the fact that Croatia at the same time stands on a much higher level of industrial development than Serbia. The whole state of historical development of Croatia was already twenty years ago completely different from Serbia as that of Transylvania is from that of Hungary.

It is necessary concretely to study these variations and all the unique conditions of the national question in every district of a state not only to define truly the general character of the evolution but also to apply the absolutely unique necessary *differentiation* in the putting forward of immediate slogans of activity and in every approach of the Communists to the masses of the subject nations in a given State and also those of the ruling country itself. Not only in Poland and the Balkan countries, but also in Czecho-Slovakia, Italy, Spain and France (Alsace-Lorraine), everywhere where in the post-war period national oppression* has got worse, it is essential to study the effect of a definite variation in our approach to the fundamental problems of the first stage of the revolution in the ruling country and the subject nations respectively.

With this difference in the fundamental tasks of the revolution, a second variation is closely connected; the moment of *inequality* in the ripening of the revolutionary upsurge and of the revolutionary situation in the various component nations of these States. This moment must be studied in close connection with the national movements in the comparatively strong subject nations (the lesser, scattered national minorities have little political significance in this connection). In general the variation in the sharpening national contradictions in these States means, of course, an exceedingly rapid accelerating factor in the ripening of the revolutionary crisis and revolutionary situation. The fact that dismembered nations and other contradictions go to the make-up of a State, makes it impossible for the

* To a certain extent Ireland is an exception to the rest of Europe in this respect; political concessions extorted from British imperialism have withdrawn the national question there from the rôle of the most powerful factor in the political life of the whole nation to a less important position, for which reason it is no longer capable of mobilising the broad masses of the people for the struggle.

ruling bourgeoisie to set up a strongly welded State power, but at the same time it presents a special difficulty to the revolutionary movement of these lands, the difficulty of welding the movement together firmly for full unity of action.

It has often happened in the course of the last ten years in Poland, Roumania, Yugo-Slavia and Czechoslovakia that there has been a fatal lagging of the revolutionary movement in the ruling country behind the tremendous upsurge of the national revolutionary movement of the subject nations. On the other hand, the opposite case is not excluded (though it is less probable), i.e., that at the moment of a great revolutionary fight on the part of the workers of the ruling nation, one or other of the subject nations is unable to raise its head at once and co-operate in the victory of the revolution in the whole country. The success of powerful revolutionary upsurge, however, depends in the majority of these countries to a rather essential degree to-day on whether the time of this movement in the ruling country coincides with the revolutionary upsurge of the workers of the subject nations; but in concrete reality such an advanced stage of revolutionary upsurge is very far from always maturing at the same time in the component national parts of the country.

Hence, then, there is the possibility and the danger of a tendency to split up the revolutionary movement into national sections among the Communist Parties of the subject nations as well as among the Communists of a ruling country. These tendencies (nearly always unconscious "frames of mind") are expressed for example in a lack of appreciation of the revolutionary movement of another nation ("Even if *they* do anything, nothing will come out of it from *them*"); in mutual alienation ("Let them get on with their own business, what have we got to do with it?"); and in attempts to subordinate mechanically the revolutionary upsurge in the subject nations to the conditions and tempo of the revolutionary movement of the ruling nation ("Let them wait, They cannot secure a victory of their national movement till the

time is ripe for our revolution"), etc., etc.

It is essential to put an end as definitely as possible to such frames of mind in whatever form they occur. The greater, in the given objective conditions the precedents for sectionalism of the revolutionary movement in a given State, *the more* the Communists must apply themselves to the task of instituting and maintaining the unity of revolutionary action in the whole State. Even as the growth of the revolutionary upsurge and the preliminaries of the ripening of the revolutionary situation proceed in an uneven tempo in the constituent parts, so nobody knows through which door the Soviet revolution will enter or where it will begin. It is probable but not obligatory that it will begin in a given country with a revolutionary attack by the proletariat of the metropolis and big industrial centres of the ruling country.

It is equally possible that the revolution will begin with a national revolt on the part of one or other of the subject nations. This last possibility is specially strong under war conditions or in the case of revolution in another country with the people of which one of the subject nations of the given State has direct relations (e.g., in the case of revolution in Bulgaria or Hungary, it is possible to expect mass revolts also in the Dobrudja or Transylvania which might prove a signal for revolution in the whole of Roumania, etc.). The Communist Party must be prepared to put itself at the head of the revolt of the mass of the workers in any national district of a State wherever the revolutionary situation first arises and immediately take all measures for a rapid mobilisation of the masses of the workers of the ruling country and other nations for revolutionary action (in such forms as conditions and the forces available exact). Only by means of simultaneous tremendous effort, by simultaneous pressure of a mass revolutionary attack throughout the State and the fullest co-operation of revolutionary action will it be possible in such a situation to avert the defeat of a revolt in a given national district, and with this wave of revolt to flood the whole country with revolution.

THE GERMAN MINERS IN THE DONBAS.
16 pp. 3d.

Unique because it has never been possible before for a group of workers, shut out from production and starved by capitalism to aid in the task of building up Socialism, to give their full technical knowledge and their full energies to increasing production in a pit—the *Amerikanka* pit, just being torn out of the steppe as part of the Five Year Plan—which, though it is situated in the Soviet Union, is felt by them and by the workers there to belong to the workers of the world. The pamphlet, written by one of the miners who went from the Ruhr, states extremely frankly the troubles they had with the contingent that went and with the technical difficulties when they got there; how they overcame these difficulties and formed the Thälmann shock brigade.

TOWARDS THE WORLD OCTOBER. *By*
P. R. Dietrich. 24 pp. 2d.

What Russia has achieved as a result of the revolution; how the Russian workers are actually building up Socialism, increasing production, wide-spreading culture—contrasting it with what capitalism has done. The pamphlet is not only vividly written but is also fully documented with facts.

★THE BOLSHEVIKS ON TRIAL (Shortly)

MODERN BOOKS LTD.
WORKERS' LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

HOW THEY DID IT.

The workers of the Soviet Union are building on many years of solid detailed skilled work—sometimes brilliant and daring, sometimes plodding and slow, but always directed to one end. The experience gained is put at the disposal of the world's workers in a new series we have started. It is difficult to over-estimate the importance of getting this series widely read, especially by comrades who are facing similar situations. Plainly written by workers they are the clearest and most interesting things we have read for a long time.

Those marked ★ are prepared under the auspices of the Society of Old Bolsheviks.

★ THE STRIKE OF THE DREDGING
FLEET: CRIMEA, 1905. *Peter Nikiforov.*
48 pp. 9d.

Tells how the author, in the period of unrest before the Revolution, went down to Kerch. How he entered the fleet, how he won confidence, how the strike was organised. A lesson in "united front" mass work.

★ UNEMPLOYED COUNCILS IN ST.
PETERSBURG IN 1906. *By Sergei*
Malyshev. 56 pp. 9d.

When the Bolsheviks worked with the Duma Councillors on public works—and how the mass movement of the unemployed and employed was deployed to keep a revolutionary front in such circumstances.

FROM FEBRUARY TO OCTOBER, 1917.
By A. F. Ilyin Genevsky. 128 pp. 1s. 6d.
and 2s. 6d.

A student officer becomes a Bolshevik. His work in the army, running printing presses, attending committees, entering into the full swing of the movement; in telling the story he recaptures the quick movement of those days and imparts their thrill.

THE CRUISER "POTEMKIN," 1905. 28 pp.
6d.

When the Tsarist Fleet mutinied: the full—and not inapposite—story.

STALIN

NEW CONDITIONS:

NEW TASKS - 2d.

TASKS OF THE WORKERS - $\frac{1}{2}$ d.

MOLOTOV

THE SUCCESS OF THE 5-YEAR
PLAN (New printing shortly)

THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION
and the TRIUMPH of SOCIALISM
(now printing)

RED CORNER

BOOK

—————a new sort of book for children.
Full of stories, poems and pictures—with
a working-class 'slant.'

112 pages, gay cover (board) - - 3/6

ROAR CHINA!

Imperialism meets the Chinese dockers. Tretiakov's famous
play translated by Barbara Nixon.

88 pages.

Crash cloth 3/6.

Paper 1/6

NEW TITLES IN THE LITTLE LENIN LIBRARY.

Paris Commune 1/-. 1905 1/-. Religion 1/- (soon)

THE LAND WITHOUT UNEMPLOYMENT

A picture sequence of the Five-Year Plan. Scores of pictures
and full appendix. 10/6
(soon)

Postage extra

INTERNATIONAL PUBLISHERS CO., INC.